

The Bannatyne Version of David Lindsay's

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis:

A Preliminary Study

Joan Hughes

The thesis is my own work and all sources  
have been acknowledged.

*Joan Hughes.*

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts  
of the Australian National University.

Acknowledgments

My deepest gratitude to Dr. W. E. Hanson, who supervised the thesis, for his inspiration, guidance and help and to Mrs. Joyce Arvey who typed a most difficult manuscript.

The thesis is my own work and all sources have been acknowledged.

*Jan Hughes.*



References to the 1602 text (C) are to The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, 1490-1555, (ed.) Douglas Bower, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1911-6, Vol. II, And Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, Version III. References to the Barnetyn text (B) are to The Barnetyn Manuscript, (ed.) W. Tod Rieupe, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1928-34, Vol. III.

Bower prints the Barnetyn text as Version II, but this cannot be

### Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude to Dr W. S. Ramson, who supervised the thesis, for his inspiration, guidance and help and to Mrs Joyce Arey who typed a most difficult manuscript.

Note:

References to the 1602 text (C) are to The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, 1490-1555, (ed.) Douglas Hamer, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1931-6, Vol. II, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, Version III. References to the Bannatyne text (B) are to The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) W. Tod Ritchie, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1928-34, Vol. III.

Hamer prints the Bannatyne text as Version II, but this cannot be used for comparative purposes because Bannatyne's interpolations are omitted. References to B give page and line number as Tod Ritchie numbers each interlude separately. The names of characters are spelt as at their first appearance in each text. When C is being discussed, the forms Chastitie, Veritie, Gude Counsall etc. are used; when B is being discussed these are replaced by Chestetie, Veretie, Gude Counsale etc.

Poems in the Bannatyne Manuscript are referred to by the volume and page number in the Scottish Text Society edition.

## Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Note	ii
Introduction	1
I <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u>	6
II Major Differences Between the Bannatyne and 1602 Texts	23
III Ser David Lyndsay[is] Play: Sertane Mirry Interludis	62
Conclusion	73
Bibliography	81

Lincoln's First Interludes or His Play,<sup>1</sup> apologises:

The editor not being able to procure a perfect copy of the edition, 1802, was obliged to have recourse to the Bannatyne MS. in the Advocates' library, in which, as far since appeared, many parts of the play are printed and only detached interludes preserved.

He was later lent a copy of B and passages peculiar to this text follow the B text in his edition.<sup>2</sup> The Bannatyne Manuscript has twice been published in full in the *Numerarian* and *Scottish Text Society* editions.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Scottish Poems reprinted from Source Editions... Collected by John Pinkerton*, 3 vols., London, 1797, Vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. xv.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 133-258.

<sup>4</sup> The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) J. B. Mackay, *Numerarian Club*, 4 vols., 1896.  
The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) W. T. Kirkpatrick, *Scottish Text Society*, 4 vols., 1928-32.

## Introduction

According to The wryttar to the redar, the concluding poem of his manuscript, George Bannatyne compiled his Ballat Buke during three months of 1568 '...in tyme of pest/Quhen we fra labor was compeld to rest' (ll. 1-2). The last item in the third section of the Ballat Buke, 'Contenand balletis mirry and Vther solatius consaittis', is 'sertane mirry Interludis from ser dauid lyndsay play.' The only other early text of the play which survives is Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, printed by Robert Charteris at Edinburgh in 1602. The Bannatyne text (B) is prefaced by its editor with a statement that he has 'writtin bot schortly' (p. 101). B is in fact well over 1500 lines shorter than the 1602 version (C) and the latter has as a consequence been generally accepted as the superior text. Pinkerton, who in 1792 published Lindsay's Eight Interludes or His Play,<sup>1</sup> apologises:

The editor not being able to procure a perfect copy of the edition, 1602, was obliged to have recourse to the Bannatyne MS. in the Advocates' Library, in which, as has since appeared, many parts of the play are<sub>2</sub>omitted and only detached interludes preserved.

He was later lent a copy of C and passages peculiar to this text follow the B text in his edition.<sup>3</sup> The Bannatyne Manuscript has twice been published in full in the Hunterian and Scottish Text Society editions.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Scotish Poems reprinted from Scarce Editions...Collected by John Pinkerton, 3 vols., London, 1792, Vol. II.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Vol. I, p. xv.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 199-268.

<sup>4</sup>The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) J. B. Murdoch, Hunterian Club, 4 vols., 1896.  
The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) W. Tod Ritchie, Scottish Text Society, 4 vols., 1928-39.



Only here is B ordered as Bannatyne intended. The Scottish Text Society's edition of Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis<sup>5</sup> provides parallel texts which Hamer labels Version II and Version III. Version III is C and Version II includes the Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyffe, which immediately precedes the main play in the Bannatyne Manuscript, and B which has 'been rearranged to form a consecutive text,' following the line order of, and 'facilitating comparison with the text of the Quarto version of 1602.'<sup>6</sup> Although they apparently do not attach much significance to the fact, Pinkerton<sup>7</sup> and Hamer do at least acknowledge that the line order of B is different from that of C. Sibbald in his heavily bowdlerized edition of 1802, which omits even the seduction of Rex Humanitas, the prologue being immediately followed by the proclamation of the arrival of King Correction, claims to be using 'the edition 1602, undoubtedly the first.'<sup>8</sup> Eight lines later he refers to the Bannatyne Manuscript in connection with the performance of the play at Cupar. He presumably thought it was compiled later than 1602 and not worth consideration as an edition of the play. Chalmers in his edition of C is blisteringly dismissive of B which he regards as

...abstracts of Lyndsay's Satyre upon the Three Estates which seems [sic] to have been made by some unlucky hand; and which ought no more to be deemed the work of Lyndsay, than an abstract of Shakespeare would be admitted, in England, as the genuine poetry of her divine dramatist.<sup>9</sup>

Laing, in his edition of C, whilst he betrays no evidence of high regard for B does at least obliquely acknowledge that the text is ordered

---

<sup>5</sup>The Works of Sir David Lindsay, (ed.) Douglas Hamer, Scottish Text Society, 4 vols., 1931-6, Vol. II.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>7</sup>Pinkerton, Scottish Poems, Vol. II, p. 199.

<sup>8</sup>Chronicle of Scottish Poetry, (ed.) J. Sibbald, 4 Vols., London, 1802, Vol. II, p. 256.

<sup>9</sup>Lyndsay's Poetical Works, (ed.) George Chalmers, 3 vols., London, 1806, Vol. I pp. 94-5.



differently from C. Commending Chalmers' decision to edit C he comments: '...indeed there could be no alternative, in order to exhibit the progress of the Play in its regular course.'<sup>10</sup> Professor Kinsley, the most recent editor of C,<sup>11</sup> in his 'Note on the Text' does not regard the differences in line order between B and C as being of sufficient importance to warrant any comment at all. He merely catalogues the more substantial omissions, asserts that C 'is the only full and reliable version of the play'<sup>12</sup> and concedes to B a very limited usefulness: 'In emendation, and particularly in repairing metrically defective lines, I have made conservative use of Bannatyne's transcript.'<sup>13</sup>

Critics have been no more inclined than editors to recognise B as a text meriting attention in its own right. In the only book on Lindsay's play, B is described as 'a series of extracts from the play... which can provide only an important ancillary to the quarto.'<sup>14</sup> Scholarly interest in the problems of dating has ensured mention of B in most articles on the play because the Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyffe is generally assumed to provide evidence of a performance of a version of Lindsay's play, of which B is an abridgement, at Cupar in Fifeshire on 7 June 1552. Houk pays close attention to the presentation of the unfrocking of friar in B but only to vindicate the 'text of the quarto of 1602...of the charge of hasty and imperfect revision',<sup>15</sup> which had previously been levied by Hamer.<sup>16</sup> John MacQueen, during the

---

<sup>10</sup>The Poetical Works of Sir David Lyndsay, David Laing, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1871, Vol. II, p. 344.

<sup>11</sup>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, (ed.) James Kinsley, London, 1954.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>14</sup>J.S. Kantrowitz, Dramatic Allegory: Lindsay's Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, Nebraska, 1975, p. 12.

<sup>15</sup>R.A. Houk, 'Versions of Lindsay's Satire of the Three Estates', PMLA, Vol. 5, (1940), p. 405.

<sup>16</sup>Douglas Hamer, 'The Bibliography of Sir David Lindsay (1490-1555)', The Library, Fourth Series, Vol. X, (June, 1929), p. 38.

course of an essay which is principally concerned with dating, examines the stage directions of B and makes the interesting suggestion that 'the Bannatyne selections were based on the actual 1552 prompt copy.'<sup>17</sup> Most recently there is William Ramson's claim that 'perhaps the most dramatic indication of Bannatyne's shaping of the "Ballettis Mirry" to his understanding of the comic is his treatment of Lindsay's Satyre.'<sup>18</sup> Here again the main emphasis is not on the play itself but rather on its function in the Ballat Buke.

That C is to be regarded as the authoritative text of the play which Lindsay wrote is not disputed. What is being claimed is that B deserves much closer scrutiny than the small corpus of incidental comment which it has so far received would indicate. Even 'Nootes of the interluyde' has been given far more attention, as is evidenced by R. J. Lyall's recent paper.<sup>19</sup> The 'Nootes' are merely an account of a play performed before the king and queen at Linlithgow on the Epiphany, 1540, which the English ambassador to Scotland enclosed in a letter to Thomas Cromwell. This account, which Hamer prints under the title Version I,<sup>20</sup> has been variously supposed to describe either a lost early form of Lindsay's play<sup>21</sup> or 'a truncated version of the original.'<sup>22</sup> Interesting as such speculation may be, it is essentially extra-literary and therefore, from

---

<sup>17</sup> John MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Studies in Scottish Literature, Vol. 3, (1965-6), p. 134.

<sup>18</sup> William Ramson, 'On Bannatyne's Editing,' Bards and Makars (ed.) A. J. Aitken et al., Glasgow, 1977, p. 178.

<sup>19</sup> R. J. Lyall 'The Linlithgow Interlude of 1540', Paper delivered at the Second International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance, Strasbourg, 1978.

<sup>20</sup> Hamer, Works, Vol. II, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Most recently by Claude Graf, 'Theatre and Politics: Lindsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Bards and Makars (ed.) A. J. Aitken et al., Glasgow 1977, p. 143.

<sup>22</sup> MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre', pp. 141-2.

a literary point of view, much less profitable than an exploration of the first extant text of the play.

Even if B were merely an abbreviated version of Lindsay's play as it survives in C, it would still be worthy of attention. The omission of passages alters emphases not only by the excision of matter but also by juxtaposing episodes which were originally separated. But B is not merely an abbreviated version of C. It contains some passages, most importantly the Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyffe, which do not occur in C and the order of the episodes is not the same. It is the purpose of this thesis to show that these variations combine to make B a play which is quite radically different from, and by no means inferior to, C.

In the first section the principal concerns of C are delineated. Section II describes the major omissions, additions and re-orderings of B in comparison with C. The final section deals with the results of these modifications as manifested in the thematic preoccupations of B.



I: Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis

Fundamental to C is the notion that the operations of the persons of the Trinity provide a model upon which earthly government should be based. Man pays lip-service to this ideal but perversely refuses to put it into practice. This is established at the very beginning of the play, which is opened by Diligence with a prayer in which man's dependence upon the Trinity is briefly and conventionally summarised. That the exemplary sentiments he expresses are unthinkingly accepted commonplaces, rather than profoundly significant truths is metrically emphasised by the bob and wheel stanza. The prayer extends from the sonorous, heavily alliterative lines of the octave into the first two lines of the wheel, the remaining three of which descend abruptly to the mundane with a request for silence during the performance. A pause is then indicated, after which Diligence launches into an epitome of the play. If the pause intervened between the prayer and the first mention of the impending performance then it could, at least arguably, indicate reverence for the Trinity. As it is, the pause is sandwiched between references to the play, which as a consequence assumes greater importance than the prayer. This initial acknowledgement of the Trinity as a supremely effective model of co-operation, together with man's failure to take account of its implications, is constantly reasserted and elaborated upon throughout the play.

The failure of Diligence to recognise the central importance of the Trinity in his opening speech is ironically recalled by the perturbation of Placebo at the absence of Solace: 'Byde he away wee ar bot shent' (l. 122). The accuracy of his judgement is confirmed after the arrival of Solace when Rex Humanitas, who made no response to Wantonnes and Placebo before the trio was united, inquires 'My servant

(l. 190).  
 Solace quhat gart 3ow tarie?'/ This apparently neutral question is, in context, an indication that Rex Humanitas is likely to prove responsive to the blandishments of the three tempters. The only preceding utterance of Rex Humanitas, his opening soliloquy, is three stanzas of eight five feet lines rhyming ab, ab, bc, bc. Passages of fairly heavy alliteration such as, 'I thee requeist quha rent wes on the Rude,/Me to defend from the deid[il]s of defame' (ll. 94-5) produce an effect which verges upon the ponderous. The tempters speak in much lighter versus caudatus eight line strophes. The head lines are of four feet and the tails of three with a rhyme scheme aaab, cccb. Placebo's greeting to his comrade, 'Solace quhy taryit 3e sa lang?' (l. 182), is the first line of the strophe which Solace completes in his reply, metrically emphasising the closeness of the relationship between them. The technique is further refined when Rex Humanitas speaks the first line of the next strophe which is again completed by Solace. But there is a difference between the solidarity of Placebo and Solace, and Rex Humanitas hovering on the brink of submission and this is metrically reflected by the extra foot in l. 190. The complete success of the three tempters becomes evident when having overheard the activities of the more sinister trio, Sensualitie, Hamelines and Danger, Rex Humanitas takes the initiative without any prompting:

Vp Wantonnes thow sleipis to lang,  
 Me thocht I hard ane mirrie sang:  
 I the command in haist to gang  
 Se quhat 3on mirth may meine. (ll. 327-30)

The oath with which Wantonnes prefaces his response, 'I trow Sir be the Trinitie' (l. 331), is a reminder of the slide which has taken place from the lip-service paid in the opening prayer to the divine Trinity as restorers of order to a world disordered by man, to a ruler voluntarily



abandoning himself to the domination of Sensualitie, Hamelines and Danger.

After the seduction of Rex Humanitas, Gude Counsall makes an affirmation of the eventual restoration of order:

Immortall God maist of magnificence,  
 Quhais Maiestie na Clark can comprehend,  
 Must saue 3ow all that giuis sic audience,  
 And grant 3ow grace him never till offend,  
 Quhilk on the Croce did willinglie ascend,  
 And sched his pretious blude on everie side:  
 Quhais pitious passioun from danger 3ow defend,  
 And be 3our gracious governour and gyde. (ll. 554-61)

Although the persons of the Trinity are not individually invoked here, the function of each is acknowledged and the prayer asserts the efficacy of the divine model. However, with the entrance of Flatterie, joined first by Falset, who greets him with 'Now welcome be the Trinitie' (l. 640), and then by Dissait, it becomes apparent that Gude Counsall will not immediately prevail. The necessity for co-operation between the three Vices and their function as a parody of the Trinity is heavily stressed. At the beginning of the discussion of the strategies by which they will beguile Rex Humanitas, Dissait makes a plea for unity: '... I pray 3ow as my brother,/That we ilk ane be trew to vther' (ll. 703-4). After the farcical triple baptism he expresses confidence in the effectiveness of their disguises: 'Devotioun, Sapience and discretioun/Wee thre may rewill this Regioun' (ll. 801-2). The absolute accuracy of his prediction is confirmed by the verbal echo with which Rex Humanitas formally admits the disguised Vices as his advisers:

Now haue I Sapience and Discretioun,  
 How can I faill to rewill this Regioun?  
 And Devotioun to be my confessour:  
 Thir thrie came in ane happie hour  
 Heir I mak the my secretar,  
 And thou salbe my thesaurar:  
 And thou salbe my counsallour,  
 In sprituall things and confessour. (ll. 870-7)

Falset's explanation of his inability to remember his new name

...sumtyme I will tak ane trance:  
My spreit wes reft fra my bodie,  
Now heich abone the Trinitie (ll. 865-7)

and Dissait's assertion that Rex Humanitas will conquer

...al christindome.  
Quhairto sir be the Trinitie  
3e ar ane verie Apersie (ll. 901-3)

are reminders of the radical distortion of values underlying the broadly comic scene in which the Vices exploit the gullibility of Rex Humanitas. The blasphemy culminates in Falset's outrageous 'Sir thank the haly Trinitie,/That send vs to 3our cumpanie' (ll. 922-3).

The Vices prevent Gude Counsall from approaching the king and, with the consent of Spiritualitie, put Veritie in the stocks. The arrival of Chastitie, the third Virtue, provides no immediate evidence that order will be restored. She is rejected by Spiritualitie and Temporalitie. The Taylour's salutation 'Now welcum be the Trinitie' (l. 1289) draws attention to the fact that three Virtues have now made an appearance. But the reasons for which the men of craft welcome Chastitie, which become apparent at the entrance of their wives, who abusively chase her away, give little cause to expect any transformation to result from this encounter. Finally, at the command of Sensualitie, the Vices imprison Chastitie in the stocks alongside Veritie. There are however indications that the domination of Rex Humanitas by the Vices and Sensualitie is about to be overthrown. The Vices themselves recognise the insecurity of their tenure and the strength of their adversaries by the agitation which the separate arrivals of an 'auld churle' (l. 945) and two women causes and by their insistence upon the necessity of preventing the Virtues from confronting Rex Humanitas. Because the efficacy of triple cooperation has been so

forcibly established for the audience, the darker implications of the present impotence of Veritie and Chastitie are alleviated by the realisation that three virtues have now been introduced, one of whom, although banished, is still at large. Consequently Veritie's speech of comfort to Chastitie carries real conviction:

Be blyth sister, I trust within schort space,  
That we sall be richt honorablie restorde,  
And with the King we sall be at concorde:  
For I heir tell divyne Correctioun  
Is new landit, thankit be Christ our Lord;  
I wait hee will be our protectioun. (11.1468-73)

Her optimism is vindicated by the immediately following entrance of Correction's Varlet whose proclamation results in the break up of the trio of Vices. Flatterie leaves to seek sanctuary with Spiritualitie. Before going into hiding with the 'merchand men' and the men of craft respectively, Dissait and Falset steal the royal treasure and quarrel over its division, Dissait eventually fleeing with the whole of it. The potentiality of the Vices for corruption is not entirely destroyed, but it is severely weakened by their disunity. Their acrimonious dispersal precludes the possibility of their reuniting once the present emergency is over and directing their energies to a common end, which of course prepares for the penultimate scene of the play when Flatterie, by agreeing to hang Dissait and Falset, saves his own life.

The breakdown in the solidarity of the vicious trio is followed by the entrance of Divyne Correctioun who, at the request of Gude Counsall, releases Veritie and Chastitie from the stocks. As soon as the virtuous trio is united, reformation proceeds apace. Under the auspices of Divyne Correctioun the Virtues approach Rex Humanitas. After he has banished Sensualitie, who is enthusiastically received



by Spiritualitie, Divyne Correctioun presents the Virtues to the king and pardons Wantonnes, Placebo and Solace upon the latter's assurance that they will in future confine their activities to the provision of harmless pleasures:

Sir wee sall mend our conditioun,  
 Sa 3e giue vs remissioun.  
 Bot giue vs liue to sing,  
 To dance, to play at Chesse and Tabils,  
 To reid Stories and mirrie fabils,  
 For pleasure of our King. (ll. 1833-8)

The Virtues reveal the true identities of Sapience, Discretioun and Devotioun to Rex Humanitas whose repentance of his misconduct and desire to make reparation are formalised by his request:

Gude counsall now schaw me the best:  
 Quhen I fix on 3ow thrie my staiks,  
 How I sall keip my Realme in rest. (ll. 1872-4)

The first part of the play ends then with an implicit acknowledgement by Rex Humanitas of what has by this time become almost a commonplace for the audience, namely, that successful earthly government must be subordinate to and modelled upon the divine operations of the Trinity.

Two other major concerns have also been raised. One of these is that Spiritualitie, ironically, is likely to prove the greatest obstacle in the way of organising the body politic in imitation of the divine model. This, suggested by the rejection of Veritie and Chastitie and the rapturous reception of Sensualitie, will emerge a great deal more strongly in the second part of the play. The other, that the reformation of the kingdom must be preceded by the reformation of the king, is firmly established by the end of Part I. It is first made explicit in Veritie's opening sermon:

Let not the fault be left into the head  
 Then sall the members reulit be at richt.  
 For quhy subiects do follow day and nicht  
 Thair governours in vertew and in vyce.

3e ar the lamps that sould schaw them the licht  
 To leid them on this sliddrie rone of yce.  
Mobile mutatur semper cum principe vulgus.  
 And gif 3e wald 3our subiectis war weill geuin,  
 Then verteouslie begin the dance 3our sell;  
 Going befoir, then they anone I wein,  
 Sall follow 3ow, eyther till heuin or hell:  
 Kings sould of gude exempils be the well (ll. 1045-56)

and formally endorsed by Divyne Correctioun in his opening sermon:

Quhat is ane King? nocht bot ane officiar,  
 To caus his Leiges liue in equitie:  
 And vnder God to be ane punischer  
 Of trespassours against his Maiestie.  
 Bot quhen the King dois liue in tyrannie,  
 Breakand Iustice for feare or affectioun,  
 Then is his Realme in weir and povertie,  
 With schamefull slauchter but correctioun. (ll. 1605-12)

The doctrine is implicit in the structure of the play. During the course of Part I Rex Humanitas is educated politically as well as morally. The opening speech of the play proper is his prayer from which, like the prayer of Diligence's prologue, there emerges an impression of distorted priorities. It is probably over-reading to suggest that at this stage of the play the failure of Rex Humanitas to invoke the Trinity is significant. It might plausibly be argued that an earthly king would most appropriately invoke God as 'King of kingis all' (l. 78) but in context the form of address does have a slightly proprietary air which colours the entire prayer. The first five lines of the prayer are a high style apostrophe to the Creator; the following nineteen are petitionary during the course of which the personal pronoun 'I' in one or other of its forms occurs twenty-six times, the possessive 'my' occurring twelve times. The closing phrase of the final petition, '...gif me grace to vse my diadeame/To thy pleasure and my great comfort' (ll. 100-1) quite explicitly indicates what is of primary importance to Rex Humanitas. The entrances of Wantonnes and Placebo are an immediate and most apt response to this prayer. The last phrase of the first line of the opening speech of Wantonnes, 'Prince but peir', (l.102) salutes Rex



Humanitas in the same terms as a few lines previously the king addresses God, strengthening the impression of dubious values which emerges from the prayer. By the end of the first part of the play Rex Humanitas has progressed from total self-absorption to the point of being receptive to the tenets of Gude Counsall's sermon:

Initium sapientiae est timor Domini  
 Sir, gif 3our hienes 3earnis lang to ring,  
 First dread 3our God abuif all vther thing.  
 For 3e ar bot ane mortall instrument  
 To that great God and King Omnipotent,  
 Preordinat be his divine Maiestie,  
 To reull his peopill intill vnitie.  
 The principall point Sir of ane kings office,  
 Is for to do to euerilk man iustice,  
 And for to mix his iustice with mercie,  
 But rigour, fauour or parcialitie. (ll. 1875-85)

At the end of Part I then, the reformed king is in a fit state to embark upon the reformation of his kingdom.

In the second part of the play the three principal preoccupations which have emerged by the end of Part I become so closely interwoven that it is not possible to treat them in isolation without becoming tediously repetitious. Lindsay's handling of them emerges with the greatest clarity from a more or less straight-forwardly chronological account and this they will accordingly receive.

Part II, claimed by Diligence to be 'The best pairt of our Play' (l. 1925), opens with a demonstration of the acute need for reformation in the kingdom. The gulf between the divine model in which each person fulfils his appointed function in harmony with the others and the disorder prevailing in the kingdom of Rex Humanitas is established immediately. Pauper's display of disrespect for Diligence, a royal servant, is followed by his climbing up on to the king's throne from

which he refuses to move until he has finished his drink. Ecclesiastical corruption, already touched upon in Part I in connection with Veritie and Chastitie, is enlarged upon next. Like the references made by the Vices to the Trinity in Part I, Wilkins' explanation to the Pardoner of the arrangements he has made for lodgings - 'Bawburdie says be the Trinitie/That scho sall beir 3ow cumpanie' (ll. 2210-11) - is a reminder both of the disorder which presently flourishes and the order which ought to prevail. Pauper's account of the social disruption consequent upon the exaction of mortuary dues is followed by an exhibition of the grosser doctrinal abuses which culminates in Pauper fighting with the Pardoner and throwing his relics into the stream. Diligence then intervenes to proclaim a parliament of 'The thrie estaitfils of this natioun' (l. 2295). The stage direction following the proclamation directs: 'Heir sall the thrie estaits cum fra the palgeoun, gangand backward led be thair vyces.' The very powerful visual effect of the perversion of order is verbally heightened by five references to the estates going backwards made by Solace, Wantonnes and Rex Humanitas within the space of fifteen lines of dialogue.

After parliament has assembled and the Vices have been imprisoned at the request of Iohne the Common-Weill, the lay estates prove biddable almost to the point of sycophancy.

My soverane Lords we will obay,  
And tak 3our part with hart and hand,  
Quhat ever 3e pleis vs to command, (ll. 2704-6)

Temporalitie assures Divyne Correctioun and Rex Humanitas. They do not however emerge merely as foils to the recalcitrant Spiritualitie. The sycophancy is mitigated in the immediate context by the request for a pardon for '...all our cryms that are bygaine' (ll. 2708) and subsequently by the barely concealed glee at the realisation of their ability to discomfit Spiritualitie.

My lord be him that al the world hes wrocht,  
 Wee set nocht by quhider 3e consent or nocht:  
 3e ar bot ane estait and we ar twa,  
Et vbi maior pars ibi tota (ll. 2833-6)

and their recognition of the advantages which would accrue from a curtailment of ecclesiastical privileges:

...mekil of our money gais to Rome.  
 For we merchants I wait within our bounds,  
 Hes furneist Preists ten hundreth thowsand pundis,  
 For thair finnance... (ll. 2848-51)

Sentiments which are fully endorsed by Temporalitie:

Sir be my faith I think it verie gude,  
 That fra hence furth na Preistis sall pas to Rome,  
 Becaus our substance thay do still consume.  
 For pleyis and for thair profite singulair,  
 Thay haif of money maid this realme bair. (ll. 2878-82)

Temporalitie and the Merchands are very far indeed from an acknowledgement of Wyclif's analogy between the three estates and the three persons of the Trinity:

Almygty god be trintye, fadir, sonne and holy gooste bope  
 in þe olde lawe and þe newe hap fowndid his chirche  
 up-on þre statis, awnswerynge or accordyng to þes þre  
 persones...So þat to þe fadir...awnsweþ þe state of  
 seculer lordis...To þe secunde persone...awnsweþ þe  
 state of þe clergy...To þe þridde person...awnsweþ þe  
 state of þe comonte.<sup>23</sup>

They do at least, however base their motives, recognise the desirability of working in harmony for the common weal.

Spiritualitie, on the other hand, is opposed to reform from the outset:

Postpone this Parliament till ane vther day.  
 For quhy? the peopill of this Regioun  
 May nocht indure extreme correctioun. (ll. 2404-6)



They protest against the imprisonment of Covetice and Sensualitie, refuse to admit the justice of any of the charges levied against them by Pauper and the lay estates and utterly discount the notion of subordination of individual interests to the common weal, replying to Temporalitie's suggestion that the division of responsibility for spiritual and temporal affairs should be arranged as it is in France: 'It is againis our profeit singulair./We will nocht want our profeit be Sanct Geill' (ll. 3090-1). Their obduracy culminates in their deprivation, during the course of which the Freir is subsequently revealed as Flatterie. At the suggestion of Veritie they are replaced by '...famous Clarks of greit intelligence' (l. 3306). There are, of course, 'thrie Clarks' and their credentials are immediately established with the Doctour's opening salutation: 'Grace, peace and rest from the hie Trinitie/Mot rest amang this godlie cumpanie' (ll. 3313-4) and confirmed in his sermon where man's final destination is defined as '...gloir eternall with th'haly Trinitie' (l. 3486). After the banishment of Spiritualitie, Divyne Correctioun, at the request of Gude Counsall, gives Iohne the Common-Weill '...ane gay garmoun' (l. 3764) and the acts of the reformation parliament are proclaimed. Of the fifteen acts ten are, not surprisingly, concerned with the reformation of the spiritual estate. The restoration of order to the realm is completed by the hangings of Common Thift, Dissait and Falset. Flatterie remains at large but his zone of operation is severely restricted

...I will with ane humbill spreit,  
 Gang serve the Hermeit of Lareit,  
 And leir him for till flatter. (ll. 4269-71)

and Flatterie alone, although more resourceful than the other Vices, has been shown to be comparatively powerless.

Flatterie's exit is followed by the brief rubric 'Heir sal enter Foly.' In the ensuing scene, the final and therefore the most memorable one of the play, all that has been laboriously striven for by Divyne Correctioun and the Virtues is shown to be extremely precariously based. Foly's sermon is a proclamation of his ubiquity:

I haue of my Genelogie,  
Dwelland in everie cuntrie,  
Earles, Duiks, Kings, and Empriours (ll. 4476-8)

and

Heir I haue b[er]locht gude chafery,  
Till ony fuill that lists to by:  
And speciallie for the thrie estaitis  
Quhair I haue mony tender maits:  
Quhilk causit them as 3e may se,  
Gang backward throw the haill cuntrie. (ll. 4495-500)

That this cannot be dismissed as idle boasting is evident from the preciseness of 'Gang backward,' a phenomenon which has been most memorably presented in action. There is also an abundance of evidence that Foly's influence is not confined to the past. Diligence asks to buy one or two of the 'Folie hats' (l. 4386). To establish the full significance of Diligence's surrender to Foly it is necessary to make a fairly lengthy digression in order to establish the special nature of the role of the character in the play.

The O.E.D. records a secondary sense of 'diligence', current during the sixteenth century, which is rather more pejorative than the primary meaning: 'Assiduity in service; persistent endeavour to please; officiousness.'<sup>24</sup> Even in its primary meaning, although the connotations of 'diligence' are usually favourable, they are not invariably so; it is possible to pursue the meretricious, or even absolute evil, with diligence. In Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis Diligence embodies a wide range of these meanings. He is, for example, diligent in the

<sup>24</sup>The O.E.D. quotes l. 3 of Dunbar's Aganis the Solistaris in Court as an illustration of this range of meanings.



favourable sense when he expeditiously carries out the instructions of Divyne Correctioun to find 'the maist cunning Clarks in all this land' (l. 3167). His behaviour towards Pauper on the other hand is certainly characterised by 'officiousness' (ll. 1926ff). That he is sometimes motivated by a 'persistent endeavour to please' is clear from the contrast between the realistic advice he gives to Pauper, 'Hald thy tounge man, it seims that thou war mangit./Speik thou of Preists, but doubt thou will be hangit' (ll. 2029-30) and the assiduity with which, once it becomes quite clear that Spiritualitie is to be deprived, he points out:

My lords, I persaeue that the Sprituall stait,  
Be way of deid purpois to mak debait:  
For be the counsall of 3on flattrand freir,  
Thay purpois to mak all this toun on steir. (ll. 3556-9)

Of all the personifications in the play, Diligence is the most neutral. He would rather espouse virtue than vice but would never discommode himself at all in the process. He is, for example, sympathetic towards the rejected Chastitie and asks Solace to intercede for her with the king (ll. 1404ff) but makes no attempt whatsoever to press the matter when the strength of the influence of Sensualitie over Rex Humanitas becomes apparent. Diligence is the character in Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis which approaches most closely to an Everyman status. He is post-lapsarian man, neither especially virtuous nor especially vicious, contriving to survive in this world with the minimum amount of discomfort to himself. There is another way in which Diligence is Everyman-like: he is the most ubiquitous character in the play. In his role as royal messenger he comes into contact, not only with the whole range of characters in the play, but also with the audience to whom he speaks directly in the prologue, the epilogue,

his speech announcing the interval and the second proclamation of parliament. Twice during the course of the play itself he makes reference to the fact that he is taking part in a performance. Once he rebukes Pauper: 'Thow art over pert to spill our play' (l. 1955). Pauper's response, 'I wil not gif for al ȝour play worth an sowis fart,/For thair is richt lytill play at my hungrie hart' (ll. 1956-7), emphasises the difference in attitude between the two characters. Pauper never steps outside the frame of the play in which he is performing. His first use of 'play' is equivocal. It may refer to the performance, but even if this is so 'ȝour' indicates that he does not acknowledge his involvement. It seems more likely that on both occasions Pauper uses 'play' to mean what it certainly does on the second, namely, 'amusement.' After the fight between the Pauper and the Pardoner, Diligence threatens to 'hang them quhen the play is done' (l. 2293). On this occasion the reference functions as a sort of half-way house between Diligence's total involvement in the events of the play and his overt acknowledgement that he is taking part in a performance. His irritable mutterings to himself about the 'daffing'(l. 2290) of the Pardoner and the Pauper immediately precede a passage in which he directly addresses the audience: 'Famous peopill tak tent, and ȝe sall se/The thrie estait[il]s of this natioun....' (ll. 2294-5). This temporary detachment from the play tends to strengthen Diligence's relationship with the audience which is quite different from that of any of the other characters. Gude Counsall in his opening speech prays for 'all that giuis sic audience' (l. 556) and subsequently makes a direct appeal: 'Now my gude freindis considder I ȝow beseik....' (l. 562), but this polite

formality is of a very different order from, for example, Diligence's 'And 3e ladies that list to pisch/Lift vp 3our taill, plat in ane disch' (ll. 1918-9). The curious character Fund-Ionet also makes what is almost certainly intended as a reference to the audience, 'Thair is ane hundreth heir sitand by,/That luifis geaping als weill as I' (ll. 323-4). This is however fairly oblique and does not involve the kind of stepping outside the frame of the play which occurs in the passages of direct address to the audience and the references to the performance made by Diligence (ll. 1955; 2293). It is probably too much to claim that there is a complete identification between Diligence and the audience. It is however certain that he bridges the gap between the world of the play and the audience and that he is the character with whom an audience might be expected to identify most closely. Given the Everyman-like status of Diligence which, because of his especial relationship with the audience, extends beyond the confines of the play, his surrender to Foly is an indication of the comprehensive nature of folly's attraction for mankind.

That folly's attraction is truly comprehensive and that rank affords no protection against it is made clear when Rex Humanitas invites Foly into his presence and encourages him first of all to preach his sermon (ll. 4466-512) and then, completely beguiled by his nonsense, urges him to '...speik of all kin things' (l. 4549). Thus encouraged Foly obliges with a diatribe upon the folly of kings (ll. 4553-95). Rex Humanitas is given no verbal response to this but his previous enthusiasm, coupled with the fact that he makes no attempt to interrupt Foly, makes it reasonable to suppose that his silence is to be interpreted as enraptured delight rather than



disapproval. In view of the importance given during the course of the play to the doctrine made explicit, for example, by Rex Humanitas at the opening of parliament, '3e ar my members suppois I be 3our head' (l. 2347), the actual dramatic presentation of the subjection of the estates to Foly is not necessary. The most powerful testimony to the complete ascendancy of Foly is the absolute silence of Divyne Correctioun whose presence on stage during this scene is drawn attention to by Diligence (l. 4332). Since his opening speech - 'I will do nocht without the conveining/ Ane Parleament of the estait[is] all' (ll. 1577-8) - it has been clearly established that Divyne Correctioun invariably works through the earthly government. That he refrains from intervening during the Foly scene, therefore, indicates his recognition that the king and the estates are completely in thrall to Foly.

At the end of the play, then, what is only barely implicit in Diligence's opening speech, namely, that man's apprehension of the importance of his relationship with the Trinity is exceedingly superficial, becomes explicit. Foly is entirely dominant and the audience, upon whose behalf intercession was made to the Trinity at the beginning of the performance, is in this final scene commended to Gilly-mouband, a fool at the court of James V.<sup>25</sup> Diligence's epilogue offers no reassurance that the Foly scene is merely a temporary aberration or that it can be accounted for by Divyne Correctioun's admission when he pardons Wantonnes, Solace and Placebo that

---

<sup>25</sup>Hamer, Works, Vol, IV, p. 240.

Princes may sumtyme seik solace  
 With mirth and lawfull mirrines,  
 Thair spirits to reioyis. (ll. 1842-4)

No reference at all is made to the matter of the play in the epilogue, where the conventional modesty topos is followed by an invitation to the audience to disperse in pursuit of other diversions. In performance of course Diligence wearing his 'Folie Hat' would make verbal comment quite superfluous.

In C it is claimed that the ills afflicting the body politic would be cured if worldly government were to imitate the divine model provided by the operations of the persons of the Trinity. If it were to be pointed out to the lay estates that they had a vested interest in striving for the common weal, then their co-operation would be ensured. The corruption of the spiritual estate is so deeply rooted that it would have to be completely replaced by committed clerics. The three estates would then function in Trinitarian harmony. Although this is acknowledged in theory, however, the total enslavement of mankind to folly makes its practical realisation an utter impossibility.

## II: Major Differences Between the Bannatyne and the 1602 Texts

### Bannatyne Text

### 1602 Text

The Proclamatioun (+277 lines)

#### Interlude 1

a. Seduction of the King (-4 lines) →

b. Gude Counsale's entrance (+2 lines) →

Bannatyne's Interlude 4

c. Rejection of Chestitie by estates (-4 lines)

d. Rejection of Chestetie by men of craft

Bannatyne's Interlude 5

Bannatyne's 1c and 1d

#### Interlude 2

The Peurman and the Pardonar (-4 lines)

#### Interlude 3

Folly (+8 lines)

#### Interlude 4

Domination of the King by Vices (+9 lines )  
(-24 lines)

#### Interlude 5

a. Banishment of Gude Counsale (-26 lines)

b. Entrance of Veretie (-43 lines)

c. Rejection of Veretie by Spiritualitie (-47 lines)

d. Captivity of Veretie (-17 lines)

e. Rejection of Chestetie by Spiritualitie (-30 lines)

f. Chestitie's captivity (-16 lines)

Bannatyne's Part II a-h

[Gude Counsall's sermon (26 lines)]

Diligence's proclamation of parliament →



Diligence's proclamation of interval (+8 lines)—————→

## Part II

- a. Announcement of Correctioun's arrival (-6 lines)
- b. Departure of Vices
- c. Correctioun's entrance (-4 lines)
- d. Release of Veretie and Chestetie (-25 lines)
- e. Banishment of Sensualitie (-20 lines)
- f. Reception of Virtues by the King (-20 lines)
- g. Chastisement of Sollace, Wantones, Placebo (-12 lines)
- h. The King asks Gude Counsale's advice

### Bannatyne's Interlude 2

[Diligence's 2nd proclamation  
of parliament (22 lines)]

- i. Entrance of estates (-36 lines)—————→

[Assembly of parliament (39 lines.  
[Objection of Spiritualitie  
(14 lines)]

- j. Entrance of Commoun weill (-12 lines)—————→

- k. Captivity of Vices (-4 lines)—————→

[Spiritualitie's objection to  
captivity of Covetice and  
Sensualitie (24 lines)]

[Lay estates' expression of  
concern for common weal  
(35 lines)]

- l. Complaint of Common weill (-28 lines)—————→

- m. Submission of lay estates to Correctioun—————→

- n. Indictment of Spiritualitie by Povertie,  
Commoun weill, lay estates (-203 lines)—————→

Activities

pp. 97-100, ll. 3-277. The Proclamation of

[Indictment of Spiritualitie by  
the Virtues (50 lines)]In view of the errors laid by subsequent  
ages as an abbreviated version of the[Divyne Correctioun sends  
Diligence to seek 'cunning  
Clarks' (28 lines )an addition the preceding of 2 by what the  
Proclamation said in regard of 1000.[Temporalitie's plea against  
inflated dowries (20 lines)]

o. Commoun Thift/Oppressioun episode (+16 lines)—————→

the statement 'Hail begone' and thus we changed it. The scene  
assumed that it was an integral part of the[Entrances of 'Clarks' (297  
lines)]

p. Unfrocking of Flattry—————→

it Interlude 1, explaining:

[Unfrocking of Piores (23  
lines)]...from the Prologue it palpably  
the play. It seems that this inter-  
lude on the first representation of the  
in life; but was omitted on the  
at Edinburgh on account of its  
gross obscenity.<sup>28</sup>[Deprivation of Spiritualitie  
(58 lines)]Bannatyne's Part II rA few years earlier than extracts from the  
26-30; 242-7), and a version of the 'Pious'[Proclamation of Acts of  
Parliament (17 lines)]

q. Hangings of Vices—————→

r. Rehabilitation of Commoun weill

Bannatyne's Interlude 3.

Diligence's epilogue (+8 lines)—————→

Presentation of David Garlick, Esq. Arnot's note states that  
indicate that Garlick's MS. contained only the Proclamation<sup>28</sup> Peterson, *Scottish Renaissance*, vol. II, pp. 109-110.<sup>29</sup> *Scottish Renaissance*, *History of Edinburgh*, (2nd ed.) London, 1970, Appendix  
1, pp. 104-5.

### Additions

pp. 87-100, ll. 1-277. The Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyfe

In view of the stress laid by subsequent editors and commentators upon B as an abbreviated version of Lindsay's original play it is nicely ironic that the first difference between B and C consists in an addition: the prefacing of B by what Bannatyne calls the Proclamatioun maid in cowpar of ffyffe. Despite this apparently unmistakable indication of the purpose of the Proclamatioun and the separation of the end of it from the beginning of the main play by the statement 'Heir begynnys ser dauid lyndsay play....,' Pinkerton assumed that it was an integral part of Lindsay's play. He entitles it 'The Auld Man and his Wife', divides it into 7 scenes and numbers it Interlude I, explaining:

...from the Prologue it palpably forms a part of the play. It seems that this Interlude was acted on the first representation of the Play at Cowpar in Fife; but was omitted on the more solemn representation at Edinburgh on account of its local circumstances and gross obscenity.<sup>26</sup>

A few years earlier short extracts from the Proclamatioun (ll. 11-20; 25-30; 232-7), and a précis of the 'Padlock Scene' which the author confesses he was '...strongly tempted to publish' but regrets he '...could not transcribe it without participating the indecency of the original',<sup>27</sup> appeared in Arnot's History of Edinburgh. Arnot's source is revealed in the title 'Excerpt from a Manuscript Play, in the Possession of David Garrick, Esq.' Arnot's note seems clearly to indicate that Garrick's MS. contained only the Proclamation which he

---

26

Pinkerton, Scottish Poems, Vol. II, pp. 199-200.

<sup>27</sup> Hugo Arnot, History of Edinburgh, (2nd ed.) London, 1779, Appendix 1, pp. 604-5.



assumes is a self-contained play, for he explains the opening speech of Nuntious as '...both a prologue to the piece, and an ingenious method of informing the spectators, that their next exhibition should be on the 7th of June.'<sup>28</sup> Chalmers, with a logic which is difficult to follow, notes that Garrick's MS., as quoted from in Arnot's History, states: 'Here begins the proclamation of the play made by David Lyndsay...' and concludes that 'This seems to imply, that those interludes [i.e. those in the Bannatyne Manuscript] were not written by Lyndsay's pen'.<sup>29</sup> Laing, on the other hand, evidently accepts what is only a slight modification of Pinkerton's view that the Proclamatioun was, at least for the Cupar performance, an integral part of the play:

...such Interludes of a coarse and indelicate character were meant for the amusement of the lower classes, during the intervals when the chief auditory had retired for refreshments. See, for instance,...the interlude of the Auld Man and his Wife, when the play was acted at Cupar-Fife.<sup>30</sup>

The ascription of the Proclamatioun, Laing, with touching regret, considers indisputable: 'the coarse broad humour which this Interlude exhibits affords but too unequivocal marks of Lyndsay's hand, to leave any doubt in regards to its authorship.'<sup>31</sup> Hamer and Kinsley both implicitly accept Bannatyne's description, referring to the Proclamatioun as the Cupar Banns;<sup>32</sup> neither raises the question of authorship.

---

<sup>28</sup> Hugo Arnot, History of Edinburgh, (2nd ed.) London, 1779, Appendix I, p. 604.

<sup>29</sup> Chalmers, Lyndsay's Poetical Works, Vol. I, p. 95.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., Vol. II, p. 345.

<sup>31</sup> Hamer, Works, Vol. IV, p. xxxiv et passim; Kinsley, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, p. 36.

<sup>32</sup> MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre,' p. 130.

Bannatyne is unhelpful on the question of Lindsay's authorship. He states: 'Heir begynnys the plocamatioun [sic] of the play maid be david lindsayis...'. Whether 'maid' refers only to the play or to both play and Proclamatioun is not clear. What is clear is that if Lindsay did write the Proclamatioun, and did intend it to serve as 'a kind of trailer - a short farce intended to whet the appetite of the locals for the main attraction to be performed a day or two later',<sup>33</sup> then he was a good deal more interested in mustering an audience at all costs than in giving them any indication of the sort of play with which they were to be entertained on 7 June. The emphases of the Proclamatioun are quite different from those of C; they are, however, remarkably close to those of B. Which observation does not signal the beginning of a defence for the view implicit in the S.T.S. edition that B is the text of the play as it was performed at Cupar in Fifeshire on 7 June, 1552,<sup>34</sup> a view which Hamer himself contradicts in his notes:

Despite a trace of revision undertaken for the Edinburgh performance,...I think that most of the gaps in the Bann. MS. are due, not to additions made for the 1554 performance, but to deliberate omissions by Bannatyne.<sup>35</sup>

The deliberation of Bannatyne's omissions apart, he twice claims that his source is the text of the play as it was performed at Edinburgh in 1554. At the beginning of the text of the play proper Bannatyne states: 'Heir begynnys ser dauid lindsay play maid In the grenesyde besyd Edinburgh...' and the *Peurman* and the *Pardonar interlude* is preceded by: 'Heir followis certane mirry and sportsum Interludis contenit in the play maid be ser dauid lindsay of the month knyght in the playfield of Edinburcht...'. Bannatyne, therefore, was quite clearly aware that he was juxtaposing a Proclamatioun intended for a particular performance

---

<sup>33</sup>MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre', p. 130.

<sup>34</sup>Hamer, *Works*, Vol. II where B is labelled Version II and supplied with the running title Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis [1552].

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 134.

to his version of the text of a subsequent performance. As he freely admits to considerable omissions from the main play it seems most unlikely that he went to the trouble of including the extra 277 lines of the Proclamatioun, being perfectly aware that it belonged to a performance which was not that of his source text, without very good reason. There is of course a very much closer relationship between the Proclamatioun in a reading text, placed immediately before the play which it advertises, and a proclamation acted perhaps as much as several weeks before the performance. It does not seem unreasonable to conclude that Bannatyne chose to exploit this relationship and included the Proclamatioun because he regarded it as having a valuable contribution to make to his version of the play. In order to discover the nature of that contribution it is helpful to look at the marked dissimilarities between C and the Proclamatioun.

The strongest impression made by the Proclamatioun is of the ubiquity of disorder. The verbal warfare between the Cotter and his Wyfe reaches its climax in a physical battle in which she is the aggressor and from which she emerges victorious. Fynlaw of the fute band, 'A nobill man of weir' (l. 106), is so disturbed by the spectacle that he instantly looks for an escape route. Suspicion that his perturbation results from fear rather than from distaste at a public exhibition of matrimonial dissension is provoked by his increasingly hyperbolic descriptions of his martial prowess:

Quhen Inglisemen come in to this land  
 Had I bene thair with my bricht brand  
 Withowttin ony help  
 Bot myn allane on pynky craiggis  
 I sowld haif revin thame all in raggis  
 And laid on skelp for skelp (ll. 122-7)



After a prayer for uninterrupted warfare, the insatiable man of action is exhausted and lies down to rest. The precariousness of the matrimonial harmony of the Auld Man and Bessy becomes apparent when, so utterly worn out by dancing with his young wife that he can no longer keep awake, he remembers to take what is quite evidently a customary precaution:

'Bessy my hairt first lat me lok thy cunt/Syne lat me keip the key as I was wount' (ll. 144-5). The three estates are seen to be solely interested in the pursuit of sensual gratification. Although even in this sphere they can hardly be described as enthusiastic and their overtures are so ineffectual that Bessy does not even bother to answer them, but responds immediately and eagerly to the Fule's exhibition of his physical attributes. The credibility of the Clerk has already been undermined by his attempted seduction of Bessy, but when he reprimands Fynlaw his diagnosis of the ills which presently afflict society is not inaccurate: 'Sen sic as thow began to brawll and boist/The commoun weill of scotland hes bene loist' (ll. 184-5). The violence of the remedy he proposes, however, is not easy to reconcile with his insistence upon the necessity for peace:

I pray to god till send ws peice and rest  
On that conditioun that thow and all thy fallowis  
War be the craiggis heich hangit on the gallowis  
Quha of this weir hes bene the fundament  
I pray to the grit god omnipotent  
That all the world and mae mot on thame wounder  
Or ding thame deid with awfull fyre of thunder. (ll. 186-95)

The Auld Man's momentary suspicions that he has been cuckolded are lulled and he continues to enjoy the illusion of a happily ordered existence. Fynlaw upon whom the defence of the realm depends, is reduced to grovelling terror at the spectacle of the Fule carrying a sheep's head on a staff.

The episode of the Cotter and his Wyfe might reasonably be claimed to provide the audience with a foretaste of the Sowtar and Taylour episodes in C. For the two interwoven episodes of the exposure of miles gloriosus

and the cuckolding of the Auld Man it becomes more difficult to find parallels in C; neither cuckoldry nor cowardice figures at all in the play. These two episodes are linked by the activities of the Fule but the resemblances between the Fule of the Proclamatioun and Foly in C are exceedingly superficial and completely outweighed by the fundamental differences between the two characters. At the end of the Proclamatioun the Fule dominates the stage. At the end of C Foly is dominant. But the domination of the Fule is quite radically different from that of Foly. Rex Humanitas, his court, his realm, the audience and, to the extent that he makes no effort to intervene, Divyne Correctioun, are all completely overwhelmed by Foly. The Fule is considerably less formidable. Fynlaw is his sole victim. His relationships with the other characters with whom he comes into contact, although not exactly ennobling are perfectly benign. Bessy certainly has no regrets about her dalliance with him and her preference for him, rather than anyone of the estates, is not merely understandable, but positively laudable. The Fule cuckolds the Auld Man, but he is careful to arrange matters so that his peace of mind is preserved. Foly is a wrecker from outside towards whom mankind is irresistibly drawn; the Fule is equally ubiquitous but a great deal less sinister. He is simply a not especially admirable, but often highly diverting, part of human life of which account must be taken. Finally destructive he is most emphatically not.

Because the other dissimilarities are to a very large extent dependent upon it, the conception of the place of folly in the world which emerges from the Proclamatioun in comparison with C is by far the most important difference between them. It is not, however, the only respect in which the emphases of the two texts differ. In C the fundamental importance of the estates is taken for granted. The system is presented as, if not

divinely instituted, at least divinely sanctioned. The failure of the estates to fulfil their appointed functions is seen as being potentially destructive of society, and their reformation is therefore a matter of the utmost importance. There is no suggestion in the Proclamatioun that the estates amount to anything more elevated than a rather amusingly ineffectual human institution, and this is despite, indeed because of, their excessive orderliness. They each make their declarations in two rhyming couplets, betraying no signs of resentment at being in rivalry with each other and making no demur when Bessy fails even to acknowledge their presence. Their obvious dereliction of duty in no way menaces the resourceful Bessy, whose recognition of the comparative vigour of the Fule is instantaneous. The spiritual estate does earn rather more opprobrium in the Proclamatioun than do the lay estates, because chastity is its especial province and the terms of the Clerk's avowal are a good deal more blunt than are those employed by the lay estates:

I 3ow beseik my lusty lady bricht  
 To gif me leif to ly with 3ow all nicht  
 and of 3our quomam lat me schut the lokkis  
 And of fyne gold 3e sall ressaif ane box. (p. 95, ll. 156-9)

The extra dialogue given to the Clerk with Fynlaw during the course of which he reveals his illogicality (pp. 96-7, ll. 180ff.) does little to improve his standing but he never approaches the ogre-like status of Spiritualitie in C. A great deal of attention is devoted in C to the reformation of Rex Humanitas as this must precede the reformation of the estates. In the Proclamatioun kingship is given even shorter shrift than are the estates. The king does not appear at all. In his opening speech Nuntious proclaims

...pat ane prince richt wyiss and vigilant  
 Is schortly for to cum in to this land  
 And purpossis to hald ane parliament (p. 87, ll. 2-4)



but there is no indication that this is to be a special event. It is one of the functions of princes to hold parliaments and nothing of epoch making importance is expected to result. No reference whatsoever is made to reformation.

As, it is hoped, will clearly emerge from an examination of the principal variations between the two texts of the play, the major differences in emphases between the Proclamatioun and C, namely, the nature of folly and the importance of worldly institutions, are precisely the same as the major differences in emphases between B and C. Given which, it does not seem too bold to assume that Bannatyne prefaced his version of Lindsay's play with the Proclamatioun in order to adumbrate the principal preoccupations of the play he included in his manuscript. One major preoccupation of C which is not raised at all in the Proclamatioun is the setting up of the Trinity as the model upon which worldly government must be based. This notion is of course entirely incompatible with the scant respect which is accorded to worldly institutions in the Proclamatioun. The opening prayer and most of the other references to the Trinity noticed in C are retained in B but the very fact of prefacing the play with the Proclamatioun diminishes their significance quite considerably. Whereas in C the prayer to the Trinity is an opening affirmation exerting its influence over all that follows, in B this function is usurped by the Proclamatioun so that the ubiquity of disorder becomes the prominently placed opening statement of the play.

P. 123, ll. 568-9, of Gude Counsale's opening speech

These two lines occur one line after a metrical change. The first sixteen lines of the speech are in two stanzas of eight five feet lines rhyming

ab, ab, bc, bc. The metre then changes to versus caudatus eight line strophes, rhyming aaab, cccb, with head lines of four and tails of three feet. Apparently Bannatyne was disconcerted by the change for the insertion of the two lines results in a metrical hotch-potch. What ought to be the first head line of a strophe becomes an isolated tail line. The content too of B's extra lines is simply unnecessary elaboration upon C's 'Quha halds me at delusion/Sall be brocht to confusioun' (ll. 571-2).

p. 156, ll. 152-9, at the end of Folly's speech and the beginning of Diligence's reply.

There does not seem to be any explanation why these eight lines are not in C other than that they were accidentally omitted by the printer, or were not in his source text.

p. 174, ll. 201-2, 209-14, bawdy repartee between Wantones, Denger and Sollace.

Hamer thinks that these eight lines were probably omitted 'on the grounds of excessive impropriety'.<sup>36</sup> If this was the reason then it is interesting that the editor of C included, for example, ll. 1323-9; 1362-3 of the scene in which Chastitie encounters the Sowtar and the Taylour, and ll. 2159-75 of the scene in which the Pardoner grants a divorce to the Sowtar and his Wyfe. Evidently 'excessive impropriety' was considered appropriate to low life but not to a courtly milieu. The juxtaposition of high and low styles in the court scenes does occur in C but it is not exploited to anything like the extent that it is in B. The editor of C could therefore afford to jettison lines which are of considerable importance in B.

p. 176, l. 234, of Falsatt's speech

The single line, 'I wat not weill bot gif I lie', is written on the

---

<sup>36</sup>Hamer, Works, IV, p. 135.

margin of the Bannatyne Manuscript, which may perhaps indicate that it was obscurely placed in the source text and missed by Bannatyne at first reading and that the printer of C, or the scribe of C's source text, missed it entirely.

pp. 219-20, ll. 683-98, dialogue between Commoun Thift and Oppressioun

Again, recourse can only be made to the printer or his source to explain the absence of these sixteen lines from C.

pp. 237-8, ll. 9-16, the middle stanza of Diligence's epilogue.

Apart from the Proclamatioun, these eight lines are by far the most interesting of those which are unique to B. They separate the modesty topos stanza of the epilogue from the stanza bidding farewell to the audience:

Adew we will mak no langar tary  
Prayand to Iesu chryst oure saluiour  
That be the requeist of his moder Mary  
He do preserve this famous awditour  
Withowt pat grittar materis do Incure  
ffor 3our plesour we sall devyse ane sport  
plesand till every gentill creatour  
To raiss 3our spreitis to plesour and confort.  
(pp. 237-8, ll. 9-16)

Hamer suggests that this stanza may have been omitted from C because of the reference to the Virgin Mary.<sup>37</sup> By 1602 Protestantism was well established in Scotland and it is remarkable that Bannatyne, editing the play when Reformation fervour was at its height should retain a reference which is so blatantly offensive to Protestant sensibilities. Bannatyne compiled his manuscript certainly after August 1560 and possibly in the year immediately following 1567<sup>38</sup> when the Confession of Faith was again incorporated in the register of Parliament, the proceedings of 1560 never having been

---

<sup>37</sup>Hamer, Works, IV, p. 135.

<sup>38</sup>The colophon which follows 3e blinditluvaris luke on fol. 290b (IV, p.107) originally read 'heir endis the haill four pairtis offis of this ballat buke anno 1565; the play is on fol. 164a-fol. 210a (III, pp. 87ff.)



ratified by Mary. The Confession of Faith declares quite unequivocally that the

...only Mediator Christ Jesus... [is] our only High Priest, Advocate, and Mediator. In which honours and offices, if man or angel presume to intrude themselves, we utterly detest and abhor them as blasphemous to our sovereign and Supreme Governor, Christ Jesus.<sup>39</sup>

On fol. 317b of the Bannatyne Manuscript a reference to Mary as mediator has been crossed out,<sup>40</sup> evidently by Bannatyne as the replacement lines are written in his hand, but this is an unique example of such apparent censorship. There are other places in the manuscript where Mary is much more directly and elaborately invoked as mediatrix of all graces than is the case in Diligence's epilogue.<sup>41</sup> It cannot therefore be claimed that Bannatyne regarded this reference alone as being of such integral importance that he was prepared to incur the detestation and abhorrence of the Protestant censors rather than excise it. All that can be claimed is that despite its doctrinally offensive content he retained the middle stanza of Diligence's epilogue, as he did other such references, and that had he not done so one of the major preoccupations of B would have been given a good deal less emphasis. In this prominently placed penultimate stanza of the epilogue the audience is given an assurance of pleasure and comfort. The benefits of indulgence in the right sorts of 'plesour' have previously been recognised by the authoritative figure of Correctioun,

---

<sup>39</sup> John Knox, History of the Reformation in Scotland, (ed.) W. Croft Dickinson, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1949, Vol. II, p. 257.

<sup>40</sup> ll. 330-1 of Henryson's This fairsaid fox thus deid for his misdede have been altered by Bannatyne from 'O mary myld medeato of mercy meke/Sitt down before thy sone celestiall' to 'O lord eternall medeator for ws mast meke/Sitt down before thy fader celestiall' (IV, p. 181).

<sup>41</sup> ll. 735-45 of The Houlate (IV, pp. 150-1) and ll. 47-8 of Quhen be devyne deliberatioun (II, p. 103), for example.

who pardons Sollace, Wantones and Placebo upon receiving the assurance:

Schir we sall mend our conditioun  
 So 3e gif ws ane fre remissioun  
 Bot gif ws leif to sing  
 To dance and play at chess and tabillis  
 To reid storyis And mirry fabillis  
 ffor plesour of the king. (p. 202, ll. 276-81)

Diligence's promise of pleasure is not therefore to be dismissed as negligible, especially as it is coupled with 'confort' which is synonymous with that 'solace' princes are allowed by Correctioun to seek 'With mirth and lefull mirreness/Thair spreitis to reioiss' (p. 203, ll. 286-7). And of course it is not only the precedent established by Correctioun which guarantees the efficacy of the promised 'plesour and confort' for it is to be made available under the even more illustrious auspices of 'Iesu chryst' and his 'moder Mary'. The primary connotations of 'plesour and confort' are undoubtedly finite; they are to result from the entertainment the 'awditor' will receive at the performance of some forthcoming play. The reference to Christ as 'oure saluour' and the ambiguity of 'spreitis', which in addition to meaning 'the mind or faculties as the seat of action or feeling'<sup>42</sup> also means 'souls', make it difficult to ignore the suggestion of eternal 'plesour and confort.' At the beginning of B then, the notion of the possibility of a world functioning perfectly in imitation of the operations of the Trinity is replaced by the notion of life as a hilariously disordered affair. At the end of B the amusement afforded by observation of this chaos, as shaped by the dramatist, is claimed to be a means of achieving eternal salvation. It is within this frame that the play proper must be seen.

pp. 104; 107; 110; 113; 116; 120; 121; 122; 124; 125; 131; 164; 166; 168; 172; 185; 194; 199; 200, stage directions.

Before embarking upon a description of the omissions from B, there is one other 'addition,' or rather series of additions which, although of no thematic

---

<sup>42</sup> O.E.D., 'spirit', II, 16b.

significance, must be noticed in the interests of completeness. B includes twenty-one stage directions which have no counterpart in C. In view of the shortness of B in comparison with C this is a high proportion. MacQueen asserts that

All those directions are closely connected with an actual performance of the play; there can be little doubt that the source, directly or indirectly, must be the producer's prompt copy.<sup>43</sup>

But, as W. S. Ramson has pointed out<sup>44</sup> some of the directions do have a certain expansiveness which seems to be more appropriate to a reading than to an acting text. An extreme example occurs at the entrance of the King after his seduction by Sensualitie where the direction 'Heir Sall thay drink And the king sall cum furth of His chalmer and call for wantones,' not in itself a model of succinctness, is followed by 'Heir the king hes bene with his concubyne and thaireftir returnis to his jung company' (p. 173). Bannatyne's own intrusions, like his opening declaration of intent (p. 101), for example, are obviously unique to B but they do not form part of the play and will therefore be discussed later.

---

### Omissions

There are throughout the two texts numerous verbal variations between B and C, many of which are extremely interesting but beyond the scope of this thesis. Discussion of omissions will therefore be confined to passages of a line or more which occur in C but not in B.

#### ll. 327-30, the command of Rex Humanitas:

Vp Wantonnes thow sleipis to lang,  
Me thocht I hard ane mirrie sang:  
I the command in haist to gang  
Se quhat gon mirth may meine. (ll. 327-30)

---

<sup>43</sup>MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre,' p. 134.

<sup>44</sup>Joan Hughes and W.S.Ramson, Poetry of the Stewart Court, Canberra, (forthcoming), chapter 6.



The omission of these lines from B results in Wantones giving the king the unsolicited information. '3one same is sensualitie' (l. 328). It cannot be regarded as a very significant omission as it delays only slightly the first overt expression of the readiness of the king to follow the promptings of Wantones and his companions.

ll. 1238-79, Chestetie's rejection by the lay and spiritual estates.

Despite the comparatively small number of lines involved this is one of the most important of the omissions from B. It comprises all the dialogue during the course of which in C Spiritualitie, the Abbot, the Persone and Temporalitie verbally reject Chastitie. In B the omitted dialogue is replaced by the stage direction: 'Heir Sall dame chestety pass and seik lugeing athort all the sprituall estait and temporall estait...' (p. 124). Added force is given to the rejection in B the rejectors not even regarding Chestetie as ranking sufficiently highly to merit abuse, let alone any explanation of the reasons for their treatment of her. At the same time, because they are deprived of the opportunity to state their cases the impact of the estates upon the audience is quite considerably diminished. Their importance is completely eclipsed by the immediately following scene, during the course of which the chaotic world of the men of craft, in which total failure to understand the concept of what Correctioun later calls 'chestetie matrimoniall' (p. 200, l. 217) is presented with great verbal gusto.

ll. 2290-3, Diligence's rebuke to the Pardoner and the Pauper.

These four lines are omitted from B because the line order of that text makes them redundant.

ll. 659-82, the opening lines of Dissait's first speech.

During the course of these twenty-four lines Dissait proclaims his ancestry, his nature, his special relationship with the merchants and finally his name.

In B, having greeted Flattry he launches into an account of his escape from Gude Counsale in which his nature is revealed, rather than merely proclaimed:

I slippit in ane fowll bordell  
And hid me in ane bawburdis bed  
Bot suddanly hir schankis I sched  
With hochurhudy Amang hir howis  
God wait gif we maid mony mowis  
And how come 3e heir I pray 3ow tell me. (p. 166, ll.64-9)

Not only is this economy more theatrically effective, it is also more indicative of the nature of deceit which does not usually announce its presence. The omission of the reference to Dissait's connection with the merchants reflects the tendency of B to play down what is heavily stressed in C, namely, the domination of each of the estates by a particular Vice.

ll. 934-43, dialogue between Rex Humanitas, Falset and Dissait.

This relatively unimportant exchange simply further emphasises, what is apparent in B, namely, the thraldom of Rex Humanitas to the Vices - 'Speid 3ow agane to me my Iois' (l. 935) and the fear which Gude Counsall arouses in the Vices.

ll. 1008-25, dialogue between Rex Humanitas and the Vices.

In content this passage is similar to the immediately preceding omission and presents in addition an exhibition of the abandonment of Rex Humanitas to Sensualitie. Solace's 'Gar Sensualitie sing ane sang' (l. 1025) is followed by the stage direction 'Heir sall the Ladies sing ane sang, the King sall ly down amang the Ladies.'

ll. 1026-68, of Veritie's opening speech.

Instead of preaching a forty-three line sermon on the text 'Diligite Iustitiam qui iudicatis terram' as she does in C, at her first entrance in B Veretie immediately announces herself: 'Gif men of me wald haif Intelligence/or knaw my Name thay call me veritie' (p. 184, ll. 67-8),

which complete openness is totally consistent with, and illustrative of, the nature of the virtue. The matter of the sermon, too, is not relevant to the B version of the play, for it is a formulation of the doctrine that all the ills of the body politic proceed from the head.

11. 1089-1143, Veritie's rejection by Spiritualitie.

B follows the same pattern at this point as was noticed in connection with the rejection of Chestetie. In C during the course of fifty-five lines of dialogue (11. 1089-1143) Flatterie informs the spiritual estate of Veretie's arrival and the dangers which may be expected to result therefrom.

Spiritualitie, the Abbot and the Persone agree that she must be imprisoned pending banishment. The Persone accuses Veritie of heresy and she refuses to recant, rather superfluously affirming: 'I haue said nathing bot the veritie' (l. 1137). In B these fifty-five lines of dialogue are replaced by the stage direction 'Heir the vycis gais to be sprituall estait And Lyis vpoun veretie desiring hir to be put in Captiuitie quhilk is done with diligence' (p. 185). This is one of the rare instances when a stage direction has greater force for a reader than for an audience. The totality of the rejection implicit in the speed and promptness of 'quhilk is done with diligence' must necessarily be dissipated in performance. Again the importance of the spiritual estate is diminished because it is given no opportunity to establish an identity by expressing its sentiments.

1. 1168, the penultimate line of Veritie's prayer.

As its opening line indicates - 'Gett vp thow sleipis all to lang O lord' (p. 186, l. 103) - Veretie's prayer, although supplicatory, is extremely vigorous. In C the prayer ends

With thy vnfreinds let me nocht be supprest:  
Now Lords do as 3e list,  
I haue na mair to say. (11. 1167-9)



The omission from B of l. 1168 makes the concluding 'I haif no moir to say' (p. 186, l. 111) even more emphatic. Veretie in B does not compromise even to the very slight extent of mitigating the terseness of this final line by prefacing it with the acknowledgement of worldly status implicit in the address 'Now Lords...'. .

ll. 1176-91, Veritie's speech on truth.

During the course of these sixteen lines Veritie rehearses scriptural warnings against rejection of truth and expresses her confidence that she will eventually triumph. The noun 'veritie' occurs three times, twice emphatically placed at the end of a rhyming couplet. A whining, self-indulgent quality, which is not consistent with the strength and assurance intrinsic to the virtue, characterises the speech. Its inappropriateness is particularly marked in view of the concluding line of her previous speech: 'I have na mair to say' (l. 1169).

ll. 1208-37 Chastitie's rejection by the Prioires.

Chestetie's second rejection in B is presented in a similar fashion to, and with similar effect to, her first rejection. Strictly, this episode in B is an expansion as well as an omission. In C there are thirty lines of dialogue during which Chastitie begs for and is refused, refuge with the Prioires. In B all this dialogue is omitted. The rubric in C, however, which follows l. 1217, 'Chastitie passis to the Ladie Prioires...' is replaced in B by 'Heir sall scho pass to the haill sprituall Estait And scho sall not be ressaut bot put away' (p. 187). This substitution of 'the haill sprituall Estait' for the Prioires makes it clear that whilst the spiritual estate's opportunities to make verbal impact upon the audience are considerably reduced in B, it is certainly not treated indulgently. Its corruption is if anything more heavily stressed than it is in C.

ll. 1404-11, Diligence's plea on behalf of Chastitie.

Even in C Diligence does not persevere in his efforts to persuade Solace to intercede with Rex Humanitas on Chastitie's behalf once he becomes aware of the dominance of Sensualitie. That he does not even make the token gesture in B emphasises the Virtue's complete isolation.

ll. 1416-19, the question of Rex Humanitas about Chastitie's identity.

Although Sensualitie does not permit him to pursue the matter, in C Rex Humanitas shows a slight flicker of interest in finding out who Chastitie is. The omission of this from B contributes to the tendency in that text to minimise the dialogue allowed to the rejectors and to maximise thereby the mindlessness of the rejection.

ll. 1432-5 of Sensualitie's banishment of Chastitie.

In B Sensualitie is permitted a mere two curt lines of dismissal:

'Pass on than sapience and discretioun/And baneiss hir owt of the kingis presence' (p. 189, ll. 166-7). The incisiveness of this highlights the formidableness of Chastitie's chief adversary.

ll. 1498-1503 of the opening speech of Correction's Varlet.

The omitted lines are upon the theme

Sirs thocht wee speik in generall,  
Let na man into speciall  
Tak our words at the warst. (ll. 1498-1500)

In B this speech is immediately preceded by Diligence's proclamation of the interval in which the same sentiments are expressed:

Prudent pepill I pray 3ow all  
Tak no man greif in speciall  
ffor we sall speik in generall (p. 191, ll. 17-19)

In a reading text there is of course no time lapse between the proclamation of the interval and the opening speech of part two and it therefore seems

probable that the lines were omitted from B because they would have been repetitious, particularly as these lines have already been spoken by Diligence in the prologue (p. 103, ll. 70-2). The lines in the epilogue are made particularly emphatic, even for the reader with a short memory, because they are preceded by the statement, which, although the last six words are written in darker ink than the rest, is in Bannatyne's hand:

'this verss Eikit quhilk is in the first proclamatioun' (p. 191).

ll. 1572-1612, the opening lines of Divyne Correctioun's first speech.

The technique noticed in connection with the first appearances of Dissait and Veretie in B is used again at the first entrance of Correctioun where his sermon on the text 'Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt Iustitiam' is omitted. The impact of his first appearance is considerably strengthened thereby because his opening speech becomes an economical self-descriptive declaration of intent: 'I am ane Iuge richt potent and seveir/cum to do Iustice...' (p. 196, ll. 125-6). Again, matter extraneous to the preoccupations of B is excised, Divyne Correctioun's sermon not only reiterating the doctrine of kingship propounded by Veritie in C, but also insisting upon the importance of the estates. It is tempting to mount an argument in support of MacQueen's suggestion that Bannatyne's source was the producer's prompt copy, based on the much greater theatrical effectiveness of the entrances of Dissait, Veretie and Correctioun in B as compared with C. A difficulty which presents itself is that in each instance thematically embarrassing material is excised. It is to the cases of Veretie and Correctioun that this is more particularly applicable, because only one reference to the doctrine that all the ills of the body politic proceed from its head survives in B. This is Correctioun's response to the protest by the king that his power is being usurped and in



context the lines read very much more like a rebuke than a formulation of a fundamentally important doctrine:

I wil begin at the quhilk is the heid  
and mak on the first reformatioun  
Thy liegis than will follow the but pleid (p. 199, ll. 205-7)

As will subsequently be shown, because of the altered line order of B, the notion is not embedded in the structure of the play as it is in C. Dissait's relationship with his 'maisteris the merchandmen' (p. 193, l. 76), is not of the same order of importance as is the idea of kingship, but here again it is simply a passing remark in B whereas in C it is insisted upon.

The suspicion that the sharpening up of the impact of the first appearance of these characters is a by-product of the omission of thematic irrelevancies rather than vice versa is heightened by B's omission from the second part of the play of three quite spectacular pieces of stage business, the inclusion of which would be counter to the principal preoccupations of the text. For the stage direction which in C follows l. 2315 'Heir sall the thrie estaitis cum fra the palzeoun, gangand backward led be thair vyces', B substitutes 'Heir sall the thre estaitis compeir to the parliament...' (p. 204). The estates in B are of so little importance that their corruption is not of any consequence and they certainly may not be permitted to attract the attention which would result from so striking an entrance. Similarly the inclusion in B of the stage directions in C which follow l. 3652: 'Heir sall thay spuilze the Prioires and scho sall haue ane kirtill of silk vnder hir habite'<sup>45</sup> and l. 2782: 'Heir Spiritualitie fames [sic] and rages', would have been contrary to the

---

<sup>45</sup>For a refutation of Hamer's suggestion that the part of the Prioires was a later expansion see Houk, 'Versions of Lindsay's Satire,' pp. 397ff.

diminution of the villainous role of Spiritualitie which characterises B in comparison with C.

ll. 1669-93 Divyne Correctioun approaches the court.

Omission of the discussion between Wantonnes and Solace as to the identity of the approaching Divyne Correctioun, Placebo's attempt to awaken Rex Humanitas and Sensualitie's rebuke of Placebo continues the tendency of the B text to reinforce the impact of Correctioun. The excision of this passage produces the impression of Correctioun sweeping straight on with Gude Counsale and the newly released Veretie and Chestetie without interruption to arouse Rex Humanitas: 'Get vp ser king 3e haif slepit annewch/Into the armes of lady sensuall'(P. 198, ll.181-2).

ll. 1725-44, Sensualitie's expulsion from court.

In B Sensualitie is allowed only four lines, to which she receives no response, asking leave to seek sanctuary at Rome when she is summarily banished by Correctioun. Her farewell to Rex Humanitas, request for sanctuary with the spiritual estate and rapturous reception by Spiritualitie:

Welcum our dayis darling,  
Welcum with all our hart:  
Wee all but feingeing,  
Sall plainly tak 3our part (ll. 1741-4)

are all omitted. This continues the by now familiar tactic consistently displayed in B, namely, the denial to Spiritualitie of the glamour attaching to an overt display of depravity. Sensualitie is also prevented from occupying the limelight for too long.

ll. 1752-68 Divyne Correctioun's rebuke of Rex Humanitas.

Here again the effect of the omission is to distract attention from Sensualitie. In B, instead of reproving the king for his dalliance with her,

Correctioun proceeds straight from the introduction of the Virtues to his presentation of them to the king so that it is they, rather than the banished Sensualitie, who are the focus of attention.

ll. 1788-90 of the speech of Rex Humanitas summoning the estates.

The three lines merely elaborate upon the ceremonial surrounding the convening of parliament. The consequent reduction of the importance attaching to the institutions of worldly government is a feature of B which will emerge much more strongly when the presentation of the actual assembly of parliament is discussed.

ll. 1827-32, Placebo's speech on the ubiquity of sensuality.

The last three lines are concerned with the predilection of the spiritual estate for indulgence in pleasures of the flesh. The omission therefore serves the dual purpose of playing down Sensualitie's attractiveness and Spiritualitie's lewdness.

ll. 1845-50, of Divyne Correctioun's speech pardoning Wantonnes, Solace and Placebo.

Out of context these six omitted lines are not very interesting:

And richt as Halking and Hunting  
Ar honest pastimes for ane King,  
Into the tyme of peace:  
And leirne to rin ane heavie spear,  
That he into the tyme of wear,  
May follow at the cheace. (ll. 1845-50)

They simply elaborate upon the sorts of 'mirth and lawfull mirriness' (l. 1843) in which princes may find solace. As was suggested in connection with the stanza of Diligence's prologue which is unique to B, the connotations of solace in that text are much less trivial than ll.1845-50



of C allow. Because of the omission of these lines, Correctioun's speech in B adumbrates the sort of 'confort' (p. 238, l.16) promised in the prologue. Diligence is an equivocal character and to have the content of his utterance endorsed by Correctioun gives it authority.

ll. 1875-1900, Gude Counsall's sermon.

The matter of Gude Counsall's sermon on the text 'Initium sapientiae est timor Domini' (ll. 1875-1900) does not conflict with the preoccupations of B. The subordination of Rex Humanitas to God is insisted upon '... 3e ar bot ane mortall instrument/To that great God and King Omnipotent' (ll. 1898-9). The omission of this passage from B is certainly dictated by thematic considerations but as these are revealed by the juxtaposition of passages and events which in C are separated from each other it is best discussed with the reordering of material in B.

ll. 2294-390, the assembly of parliament.

The omission of these lines from B results in the exclusion from that text of Diligence's second proclamation of parliament, the comments of Wantonnes, Solace, Rex Humanitas and Placebo upon the entrance of the estates 'Gangand backward' (l. 2321), the formal submission of the estates to the king, his equally formal response:

Welcum to me my prudent Lord[il]sall,  
3e ar my members suppois I be 3our head:  
Sit down that we may with 3our iust counsall,  
Aganis misdoars find souveraine remeid.  
Wee sall nocht spair for fauour nor for feid,  
With 3our avice to mak punitioun,  
And put my sword to executioun. (ll. 2373-9)

and finally the ceremonial opening of parliament: 'Sit down sir scribe, and sit down dampester to:/And fence the Court as 3e war wont to do'(ll.2389-90). The significance of the parliament is as a consequence very considerably diminished in B.

ll. 2399-2412, Spiritualitie's protest.

As is consistent with the reduction of Spiritualitie's role in B, the speech advising against the parliament which concludes

Postpone this Parlament till ane vther day.  
For quhy? the peopill of this Regioun  
May nocht indure extreme correctioun (ll. 2404-6)

and Divyne Correctioun's rebuttal are omitted (ll. 2399-412).

ll. 2439-42; 2451-8, dialogue of Rex Humanitas and Iohne the Common-Weill.

The omission of these lines removes from B references to the estates going backwards.

ll. 2487-2550, following the putting of the Vices in the stocks.

Apart from four insignificant lines reviling the Vices spoken by the Secund Sergeant (ll. 2487-90) the omission of this passage from B is in accordance with tendencies which are by now well established. The excised material includes Spiritualitie's defence of Covetice and Sensualitie-- 'Thir is my Grinter and my Chalmerlaine' (l. 2495)-- the acknowledgements by the lay estates of the importance of being guided by Gude Counsall and of the centrality of the commonweal and Common-Weill's admission to the parliament of Pauper on the grounds that 'He will complaine als weill as I' (l. 2550).

ll. 2619-46 of Iohne the Common-Weill's complaint.

The theme of the complaint is 'Qui non laborat manducet' (l. 2600). The omitted lines elaborate upon the condemnation of those members of the spiritual estate who, having taken vows to observe poverty, simply become a charge upon the body politic, indulging in '...sleuthfull idilnes/Against the Common-weill expresse' (ll. 2645-6). It is important to note that as is frequently the case in B's presentation of Spiritualitie, the substance of the charge is retained but it is not enlarged upon.

ll. 2751-2824; ll. 2833-3051, exposure of Spiritualitie's corruption.

The omitted passages detail clerical abuses including episcopal sexual promiscuity, the exaction of mortuary dues, papal provision to minor benefices, simony, pluralism (with the exception of clerics of the 'blude Royall' (l. 2870) who were evidently to be allowed to hold more than one benefice), neglect of preaching, and illiteracy. Iohne the Common-Weill attributes present ecclesiastical corruption to King David's lavish endowments to the Church. '...he narrowit sa his bounds/Of 3eirlie rent thriescoir of thowsand pounds' (ll. 2958-9). The lay estates agree 'That the Kings grace sall gif na benefice/Bot till ane p[er]leichour that can vse that office' (ll. 3035-6). Spiritualitie's expressions of recalcitrance become increasingly self-incriminatory,

Na sir, be him that our Lord Jesus sauld,  
I red never the New testament nor auld:  
Nor ever thinks to do sir be the Rude.  
I heir freiris say that reiding dois na gude (ll. 2919-22)

and of course entertaining. Other significant casualties which result from the omission of this passage are that Gude Counsall's 'Wee came to make gude reformatiouns' (l. 2802) does not occur in B, and neither does his implicit acknowledgement of the necessity for co-operation between the estates:

I wil conclude nathing of that as now,  
Without my Lord of Spiritualitie  
Thairto consent, with all this haill cleargie. (ll. 2818-20)

ll. 3091-100, Spiritualitie's lack of concern for the commonweal.

Spiritualitie is here deprived of only a single line in B 'Wee will nocht want our profite be Sanct Geill' (l. 3091), a sentiment which is clearly implied in the immediately preceding line 'It is aganis our proffeit singulair' (p. 216, l. 601). The other omitted lines are Temporalitie's



rebuke of Spiritualitie for refusing to subordinate its particular interests to the pursuit of the commonweal. It is the importance of cooperation between the estates which is diminished by the omission of this passage rather than the villainy of Spiritualitie.

11. 3103-200, the events leading to the decision to deprive Spiritualitie.

This passage includes the indictments of Spiritualitie by Veritie and Chastitie, Veritie's suggestion that the spiritual estate should be deprived and replaced by 'the maist cunning Clerks of this natioun' (l. 3125), the unfavourable comparison made by Gude Counsall between the Taylour and the Sowtar, Divyne Correctioun's dispatching of Diligence in search of 'cunning Clarks' (l. 3167) and Temporalitie's plea to Divyne Correctioun to regulate dowries which have been inflated by affluent Spiritualitie's eagerness to marry off its bastards. Again the omitted passage includes a reference by Gude Counsall to the necessity for reformation (l. 3152), a sentiment which is endorsed by Divyne Correctioun (l. 3200).

11. 3305-602, the entrances of the 'thrie Clarks'.

This is followed by Divyne Correctioun's examination of Spiritualitie whose defence consists of an admission of all the charges previously levied against it in C. The Abbot's account of his conduct of his abbey is a good example:

Tuiching my office I say to 3ow plainlie,  
My Monks and I, we leif richt easelie.  
Thair is na Monks from Carrick to Carraill  
That fairs better and drinks mair helsum Aill.  
My Prior is ane man of great devotioun:  
Thairfoir daylie he gets ane double portioun. (11. 3394-9)

The Doctour, in response to Divyne Correctioun's invitation, preaches a model sermon which provokes the ridicule of the Abbot and the Persone.

The First Licent argues against ecclesiastical possession of property and the Batchelor pleads '...my Lords mak reformatioun' (l. 3597).

ll. 3652-74, the unfrocking of the Piores.

Only one mention of the Piores survives in B; Diligence remarks to Chestetie: 'Lo quhair thair sittis ane piores of renown/Amang the rest of spiritualitie' (p. 187, ll. 132-3). The drastic reduction of her flamboyant role in C is of course demanded by the much more subdued presentation of the whole spiritual estate in B.

ll. 3705-62, the deprivation of Spiritualitie.

Corrupt as Spiritualitie certainly is in B, its deprivation is of no consequence because of the low esteem in which all worldly institutions are held.

ll. 3786-96, the proclamation of the acts of parliament.

The significance of this omission lies not only in the content of the acts - of the fifteen, ten are concerned with the reformation of the spiritual estate - and of the importance accorded to the parliament by the presence in it of Divyne Correctioun, but also because the preamble to the proclamation gives equal authority to Divyne Correctioun and Rex Humanitas, as well as acknowledging their debt to the estates:

It is devysit be thir prudent Kingfils,  
Correctioun and King Humanitie,  
That thair Leigis induring all thair Ringis,  
With the avyce of the estaitfils thrie... (ll. 3793-6)

The omissions from B then combine to inflate the importance of Correctioun and to strengthen the impact of the Virtues. The King, the estates and parliament are all correspondingly diminished in stature. Spiritualitie's role in particular is heavily pruned in B where it is never allowed to provoke the amusement and consequent fascination for the audience which results from its excesses in C. The Vices, it may be remarked, have figured hardly

at all in the discussion of omissions. Their role in B is rather more sinister than it is in C but this results partly from their occupation of the vacuum which is left by Spirituality's demotion from the role of arch-villain and partly from the general lack of importance attaching to the malfunctioning of worldly institutions. When the reordering of B is examined this heightening of the importance of the Vices will emerge more clearly.

One further observation must be made about the nature of omissions from B: there are extraordinarily few cases (ll. 327-30; 934-43; 1008-25; 2487-90; a total of only thirty-six lines out of well over fifteen hundred) in which omissions appear to be random. As has been shown the vast majority can be accounted for in the light of thematic considerations. In a few cases material has been omitted for technical reasons. An example of this is the absence from the speech of Correctionis Varlet of ll. 1498-1503, the content of which is similar to Diligence's immediately preceding proclamation of the interval (p. 191, ll. 17-20). The omissions of references to the estates going backwards can be accounted for on both thematic and technical grounds. B's omission of the stage direction, 'Heir sall the thrie estaits cum fra the palzeoun, gangand backward'... obviously entailed the omission of the comments which in C are provoked by the entrances (ll. 2316ff). The much later comments of Iohne the Common-Weill (ll. 2442, 2453) could have been allowed to stand as they would have had the purely metaphorical status of lines like 'The commoun weill hes bene amang his fais' (p. 206, l. 344) and '3e pat ser garris the commoun weill want clais' (p. 206, l. 345). Their careful excision, involving the omission of four lines of dialogue between Rex Humanitas and Iohne the Common-Weill (ll. 2439-42) and eight lines from the middle of Iohne the Common-Weill's speech (ll. 2451-8), is in accordance with the lack of importance attaching to worldly institutions. The sole surviving reference



in B to the estates going backwards is not an editorial blunder, but rather a stroke of genius. It occurs in Folly's speech (p. 159, ll. 253-4) where it impresses merely as a characteristic aberration.

---

### Rearrangements

#### Chestetie's rejection by the estates and men of craft.

The first instance of reordering of material coincides with the first significant omission from B. This is at the point when the king and his tempters having left the stage to go 'to the chalmer' (p. 122) with Dame Sensualitie and her attendants, Gude Counsale makes his first appearance. The conclusion of Gude Counsall's opening speech is followed in C by the entrances of the Vices and the plotting and accomplishment of their subjugation of Rex Humanitas. In B it is followed by Chestetie's rejection by 'all the sprituall estait and temporall estait' (p. 124) and her encounter with the Sowttar and Teilgeour. The rearrangement shifts the focus away from Rex Humanitas and his abandonment of chastity is shown to be representative of the general condition. It is important to note that there is no suggestion that the rejection of Chestetie by the estates results from the example set by the king, nor are the men of craft shown to be in any way infected by the attitude of the estates. It takes five hundred and twenty-five lines of dialogue to bring the king to the point of saying to Dame Sensualitie 'Wylcum to me perles of pulchritude' (p. 121, l. 526) and instructing 'Sollace convoy this lady to my chalmer' (p. 121, l. 529). His subjects on the other hand are presented as failing to be even momentarily attracted by Chestetie and not as being fairly lengthily seduced from her. Chestetie's universal rejection closes the first of what in B are called 'interludis'.

#### The Peurman and the Pardonar

In C the Peurman and the Pardoner episode opens the second part of the play; in B it is the second interlude. In C the episode functions as a demonstration

of the disorder prevailing in the realm of the newly reformed king. In B it works rather differently. During the course of this scene the king is in 'the chalmer' with Dame Sensualitie. This, and the prominent placing at the end of the immediately preceding interlude of Chestetie's account of her reception by the temporal and spiritual estates (p. 130, ll. 710-13) gives particular emphasis to the theme of the degradation of chastity, which culminates in the farcical divorce granted by the Pardonar to the Sowttar and his Wyfe. This broadly comic scene, which hovers on the brink of the disgusting, makes a devastating comment upon the abandonment by the king of chastity. No matter how superficially elegant and courtly Dame Sensualitie may be, recognition of her affinities with the Sowttaris Wyfe, who complains:

Cawsis to pairte I haif anew  
becauss I get na chalmer glew  
I tell 3ow verralie  
I marvell not sa mot I thryve  
suppois that swngeour nevir swyve  
He is baith cawld and dry. (p. 141, ll. 232-7)

is, in context, difficult to avoid. The debauchery of the king is not interestingly wicked, merely comically squalid.

### Folly.

The Peurman and the Pardonar interlude also functions in B as a prelude to the Folly episode which in C closes the play but which is in B the third interlude. In the world of the Peurman and the Pardonar, at the very bottom of the social scale, the all-pervading impression is of the dominion of folly, but it is the folly represented by the Fule of the Proclamatioun rather than by the character Foly in C. The Sowttar and his Wyfe are evidently happy with their bogus divorce: 'Schirris saw 3e evir mair sorrowles depairting' (p. 142, l. 253). The Peurman is equally gullible but he does finally and effectively rebel against his exploitation by the Pardonar. The placing of the Folly interlude immediately after the

Peurman and the Pardonar interlude in B reverses the movement of the first interlude down from a demonstration of the actual process by which Rex Humanitas turns away from chastity to the appearance of the allegorical character among his subjects. The phenomenon of folly first makes an appearance in the Peurman when it elicits sympathetic response from the audience and culminates in the very much less sympathetic captivation of the king by its quite undisguised manifestation in the character of Folly. The structure of B here confirms positively what was noticed in connection with the presentation of Chestetie, namely, that there is no endorsement of the notion that the ills of the whole body politic proceed from its head. The rearrangement also results in a presentation of Folly which, like the folly of the Peurman and the Pardonar interlude, approximates much more nearly to the Fule of the Proclamatioun than to the Foly of C. Instead of being an extremely formidable perverter of divinely ordained order who emerges after the eradication of the Vices to triumph unchallengedly and finally, the Folly of B whilst undeniably vigorous is eclipsed in importance by the Vices, the first entrances of which begin the fourth interlude. The Folly of B is ubiquitous, ineradicable, diverting, even, as manifested in Peurman, endearing; it is sometimes disgusting and always potentially dangerous, its embracement opening the way to domination by the Vices. Life is however capable of accommodating its vagaries. It is not overwhelming.

#### Chestetie's second rejection

The second rejection of Chestetie by Spiritualitie, the next variation between B and C, is not really a rearrangement of material and has already been discussed as an omission. Further comment is warranted here, however, because as a result of the transference of what is in C the only rejection of Chastitie by the whole of Spiritualitie and Temporalitie to the end of



the first interlude in B, and of the substitution of 'the haill sprituall Estait' (p. 187) in B for, what is in C, a rejection by the Piores only, Chestetie's rejection in the fifth interlude of B is, in that text, her second rejection by the whole spiritual estate. The fact that the two rejections are separated by three interludes, and also that Temporalitie is not implicated in the second, considerably strengthens the force of Spiritualitie's dismissal of Chestetie in B. It also increases sympathy for the plight of the Virtue, who in C makes her first entrance at l. 1192 and by l. 1440 is in the stocks, whereas in B she first seeks refuge after l. 599 of the first interlude and is still wandering around harbourless at l. 140 of the fifth interlude.

#### The Interval

The spectacle of Veretie and Chestetie in the stocks closes B's fifth interlude. Veretie's prophecy of the imminent arrival of Correctioun is immediately followed by Diligence's proclamation of parliament which brings to an end 'the first pairt of our play' (p. 191, l. 10). Instead of the interval being placed between the reformation of Rex Humanitas and a scene in which the need for reformation in the kingdom is presented, as is the case in C, it occurs in B, after the corruption of both king and kingdom have been established, at the point when Gude Counsale is banished, Chestetie and Veretie are in captivity, the Vices are completely triumphant, and disorder is at its highest point. This rearrangement of material has four important consequences. First, it destroys the structural affirmation of the doctrine 'Let not the fault be left into the head/Then sall the members reulit be at richt' (ll. 1045-6) and therefore the reformation of the realm must be preceded by the reformation of the king which is embedded in the arrangement of the episodes in C. Secondly, the closing of the first part of the play with the two Virtues in the stocks, where they must remain

throughout an interval which is of sufficient length for the spectators to 'tak ane drink and mak collatioun' (p. 191, l.11), by prolonging the spectacle of their degradation and captivity considerably increases the audience's apprehension of, and sympathy for, their plight. Thirdly, in B, the importance of the impending assembly of parliament, with the proclamation of which Diligence prefaces his announcement of the interval, is greatly diminished. The proclamation is issued upon the authority of a king who is completely under the domination of the Vices and it is made by Folly's first customer. This diminution of the stature of parliament is in strong contrast to what happens in C. Here Gude Counsall's sermon on the text 'Initium sapientiae est timor Domini' (l. 1875), preached in response to the request of Rex Humanitas as to how he ought to go about governing his kingdom effectively, is immediately followed by Diligence's proclamation of parliament which, as a consequence, seems to be almost divinely instigated. Fourthly, and really almost inseparable from the third effect of the placing of the interval in B, the entrance of Correctioun is given greater significance in B than is the case in C. In B Veretie's prophecy of the advent of Correctioun, which closes part one, is picked up at the very beginning of part two, which opens with the announcement, 'Schiris stand a bak and hald 3ow coy/I am the king correctionis boy' (p. 192, ll. 33-4). In C the prophecy and the promise of its fulfilment follow each other with no interruption. In B these two references to Correctioun flank Diligence's proclamation of parliament and contribute to its already observed unimpressiveness. The devaluation of the importance of parliament results in the inflation of the importance attaching to the impending entrance of Correctioun.

### The entrances of the estates.

The transference of the Peurman and the Pardonar episode from the beginning of part two in C to become the second interlude in the first part of B contributes substantially to the diminution of the importance attaching to the proper functioning of the estates in B. The spectacular entrance of the estates in C follows the Peurman and the Pardonar scene as the culminating demonstration of the disorder prevailing in the kingdom. Their considerably less spectacular entrance in B, as a result of the rearrangement of episodes together with the omissions of Gude Counsall's sermon (ll. 1875ff) and Diligence's second proclamation of parliament (ll. 2294ff.), is the only answer which the question of the king, 'how sall I keip My realme in rest' (p. 204, l.311) provokes. This is, in the context of B, an extremely ironic response.

### The clothing of Iohine the Commoun weill.

The final instance of reordering of material in B is the transference of the short scene, which in C precedes the proclamation of the acts of parliament, to the very end of the play. This is the scene in which, at the request of Gude Counsale, Iohine the Commoun weill is given 'ane gay garmoun' (p. 236, l.1123) by Correctioun. Again the effects are produced by a combination of rearrangement and omissions. The first effect is to heighten the importance of the Vices. In C the Vices' occupation of the centre of the stage from the time that Flatterie is apprehended by the First Sergeant (l. 3621) until the final exit of Flatterie (l. 4271) is interrupted upon four occasions: by the deprivation of the Piores (ll. 3653-74), by the deprivation of the rest of the spiritual estate (ll. 3705-62), by the clothing of Iohne the Common-Weill (ll. 3763-86) and, finally, by the proclamation of the acts of parliament (ll. 3787-961). In B as a result of omissions and re-orderings these interruptions do not occur. The eradication of the Vices, the real causes of the world's



disharmony in B, proceeds with no side-tracking. It is not, as it is C, dependent upon the deprivation of the recalcitrant spiritual estate, the replacement of which allows parliament to fulfil its appointed function. The second effect, which is closely related to the first, is to reduce the importance of Spiritualitie. In C the aggrandizement of Common-Weill is made possible by the banishment of Spiritualitie who was responsible for the malfunctioning of the three estates and hence for the parlous state of the commonweal. In B the rehabilitation of Iohne the Commoun weill is a direct consequence of the eradication of the Vices from the world. The reward considered to be commensurate with his improved status in C is indicated by the rubric which follows l. 3772: 'Heir sal thay cleith Iohne the common-weill gorgeouslie and set him down amang them in the Parliament.' In B, as is consistent with the emphases of that text, the rubric is omitted; Common weill's reward is that his speech celebrating the restoration of order becomes the final one of the play proper.

What might be called the negative results of the removal of the Foly episode from the place it occupies at the end of C, as opposed to the already noted positive results of its becoming the third interlude in B, are of course of huge importance. Correctionoun and his lieutenants the Virtues are entirely triumphant having destroyed the Vices, the arch-villains of B and, by reinstating Iohne the Commoun weill, restored order.

The principal effects of the rearrangement of material in B, then, are to diminish the importance attaching in C to the establishment of worldly order as represented by Rex Humanitas, the estates and, in particular, to their cooperation as a parliament and to increase the importance of the Vices, the Virtues and, most especially, of Correctionoun as an efficacious, because supernatural, restorer of order. Spiritualitie's corruption is preserved but, in accordance with the general reduction of importance of the estates, the significance of that corruption to the

rest of society is considerably lessened. The conception of folly and its place in the world is greatly modified, the universal destroyer of C being replaced by the equally universal but very much less sinister character of B.

The rearrangement of material, then, is as carefully calculated as are the additions to and omissions from B. It is also noteworthy that the effects produced by additions and the effects produced by omissions are remarkably similar both to each other and to the effects which are produced by rearrangement. Sometimes the three devices are exploited simultaneously and almost inextricably to produce a particular effect. The presentation of Chestetie provides an especially striking example of the use of this technique. In B, the rubric of C is expanded, the dialogue of C is omitted and the line order of C is changed. This combination results in a presentation of the virtue which alters the significance of the seduction of the king, increases the corruption of Spiritualitie whilst reducing its ability to make an impact upon the audience and increases the sympathy which is elicited by the plight of Chestitie.

### III Ser Daid Lyndsay[is] Play: Sertane Mirry Interludis

A disadvantage of this sort of comparative study is that it is not easy to avoid giving the impression that appreciation of B is dependent upon an acquaintance with C. This is not at all the case. B is a finely constructed play which can be enjoyed quite independently of C. It is, however, not improbable that at least some members of Bannatyne's putative audience<sup>46</sup> who were familiar with his source had an extra dimension added to their appreciation of his version of Lindsay's play. The principal aim of this section, however, is to defend the assertion that B can very profitably be read quite independently of C. Reference to C will therefore be scrupulously avoided, and it is hoped, with a good deal less confidence, too much tedious repetition of points already established.

The presentation of the cheerfully chaotic world of the Proclamatioun closes with the warning of Nuntious:

And 3e ladyis that hes Na skant of leddir  
Or 3e cum thair faill nocht to teme 3our bleddir  
I dreid or we haif half done with our wark  
That sum of 3ow sall mak ane richt wait sark (p.100, ll. 274-7)

which completely overshadows Diligence's opening prayer of the main play. The entertaining liveliness of the Fule and Bessy predisposes the reader to respond sympathetically to the opening remark of Wantones which follows the prayer of the king 'quhat garris 3ow mak so dreiry cheir/Be glaid sa lang as 3e ar heir' (p. 104, ll. 103-4). The world of the Proclamatioun is frequently evoked throughout the scene leading up to the seduction of the king. It is first introduced by Wantones:

I left sollace that loun  
Drinkand doun in to be toun  
It will coist him half ane croun  
Thocht he had na mair. (p. 105, ll. 126-9)

<sup>46</sup>

Whether or not Bannatyne intended to publish his Ballat Buke, he clearly had some kind of audience in mind, the manuscript being punctuated with addresses entitled The Wryttar to the reidar (II, p. 1) or a variation thereof.



These lines describe a situation which the Cotter, who pleads 'I am sa dry dame or I gae/I mon ga drink ane penny or twae' (p. 91, ll. 85-6), would regard as utterly delightful. The next four lines of this speech of Wantones introduce another element:

And als he said he wald gang see  
ffair lady sensualitie  
The beriall of bewtie  
And portratour preclair. (p. 105, ll. 130-3).

The courtly world is represented in the Proclamatioun, the Courteouer's attempted seduction of Bessy (p. 94, ll. 148-51) is expressed in courtly language. The Courteouer is, however, lamentably unsuccessful. The juxtaposition of the courtly and the colloquial almost always works to the disadvantage of the former but in this speech of Wantones, the effect is accentuated by the severe devaluation of courtliness in the Proclamatioun. Alternation of the courtly and the colloquial continues throughout the scene preceding the seduction of the king, the colloquial occasionally degenerating into the downright bawdy:

Or 3e tuik skaith be godis croun  
I leir thair was not vp and down  
Ane tvme cunt in all this toun  
Nor ten mylis abowt. (p. 115, ll. 389-92)

Sometimes evocation of the Proclamatioun is quite specific. Sollace's remark to the king about the charms of Sensualitie, 'It wald gar all 3our flesche arryiss/to luik on hir face' (p. 208, ll. 204-5) recalls the Fule's seduction of Bessy:

I haif na mair geir nor 3e sie  
Swa lang as this may steir or stand  
It sall be ay at 3our command. (p. 95, ll. 161-3)

And the apostrophe of the king to Sensualitie, 'Wylcum to me Thow sweittar nor the lammer' (p. 121, l. 527) verbally echoes the Marchand's address to Bessy: 'My fair maistres sweitar than the lammer' (p. 94, l. 152). The effect of these correspondences is to emphasise that the disorder prevailing in the world of the Proclamatioun is truly universal. Not only do the king and the Fule

indulge in sensuality, but the king's indulgence is no more lofty than the Fule's. It is if anything made more ludicrous by what his response to the extreme uncourtliness of his tempter proves to be merely a veneer of courtliness. It is also more reprehensible; the Fule does not make his first, nor any subsequent, appearance at prayer.

Gude Counsale in his opening soliloquy which, it will be remembered, immediately follows the departure of the king and his court 'to the chalmer,' inspires confidence. This is partly of course consequent upon his declaration 'My Name is gude counsale' (p. 123, l. 567) but even before this, his prayer impresses as being of a different order from the two which precede it. As has been remarked, Diligence's opening prayer is trivialised by its trailing off in the wheel into a demand for silence during the play and that of the king is characterised by complete self-absorption. Gude Counsale's prayer (p. 122, ll. 550-7) is for the well-being of the members of the audience and he does not intrude himself between them and God at all. The passage of direct address which follows the prayer is a courteous - the audience is saluted as 'my soveranis' (p. 123, l. 558) - dignified, general account of the misfortunes suffered by those who disregard good counsel, followed by a shrewd appraisal of the present situation '...in this realme I wald mak sum repair/gif I belevit My Name sowld not forfair' (p. 124, ll. 592-3) and concluding with 'So till I se God send mair of his grace/I purpoiss till repoiss me In this place' (p. 124, ll. 598-9). It is the restraint of the utterance which is particularly impressive and gives authority to this first proposal of a solution to present disorder, namely, reliance upon the grace of God.

The prudence of Gude Counsale's decision not to intervene at once is given immediate confirmation by Chestetie's rejection by the spiritual and temporal estates. The similarities between the world of the Sowttar and the

Teilgeour, as it is presented in their encounter with Chestetie, and the world of the Proclamatioun are obvious. The relationship between the Cotter and his Wyfe is paralleled by the relationships between the men of craft and their wives. The observation of Nuntious to the Cotter '...thow mon keip thy chestety as efferis' (p. 89, l. 55) is recalled by the men of crafts' enthusiastic reception of Chestetie. When, at the entrance of their wives, the reason for their enthusiasm becomes apparent it is seen to be a comment upon the nature of chastity which, though not identical with, is equally as ironic as the Cotter's response to Nuntious:

I sall leif chest As abbottis monkis and freiris  
Maister quhairtò sowld I my self miskary  
Quhair I as preistis may swyve and nevir mary.  
(p. 89, ll. 56-8)

The men of crafts' fondness for drinking is also of course reminiscent of the Cotter's, and the Teilgeour's invitation to Chestetie '...lat ws play cop owt' (p. 125, l. 615) is a direct verbal echo of the response made by Hamelines to the suggestion of the king that she and Wantones ought to entertain each other: '...he and I shall play cop owt' (p. 121, l. 535). But the connection of the Sowttar and the Teilgeour with the court does not depend solely on something as tenuous as the repetition of a cliché. Their trades were especially closely related to the maintenance of the external trappings of courtliness:

Sowtaris with schone weill maid and meit  
3e mend the faltis of illmaid feit...  
And 3e tailgouris with weillmaid clais  
Can mend the werst maid man that gais.<sup>47</sup>

Their function as preservers of an elegant exterior is expressed in the Sowttar's first speech to Chestetie 'We sall mend baith your hoiss and schone' (p. 124, l. 606) and the Teilgeour's salutation indicates that he imagines he belongs to the courtly milieu: 'Is this fair ledy chestety' (p. 125, l. 608). The result of these connections between the worlds of

---

<sup>47</sup>William Dunbar, Pe Amendis to be Telgouris and Sowtaris, II, p. 299, ll. 13-14.



the Sowttar and the Teilgeour, of the court and of the Proclamatioun is to reiterate insistence upon the ubiquity of disorder as manifested in rejection of, and misunderstanding of the nature of, chastity. The one tiny hint that the eventual restoration of order may be a possibility emerges from the Teilgeour's salutation to Chestetie. Her identity is so palpable that the Teilgeour, who is certainly not otherwise distinguished by his perspicacity, recognises her on sight.

The Peurman and the Pardonar interlude brings together all the themes adumbrated in the Proclamatioun and developed in the foregoing interludes. Disorder is rampant. The Peurman desecrates the royal throne. The Pardonar exploits the gullibility of the Sowttar and his Wyfe and also of the Peurman. Chastity is grossly abused both in the divorce of the Sowttar and his Wyfe and also in the prospective enjoyment by Wilkin and the Pardonar of the charms of 'gud kynd christane andirsoun' (p. 144, l. 279) and 'Bawburdie' (p. 144, l. 284). Clerical corruption in the conduct of ecclesiastical courts, (pp. 133-6, ll. 39ff.), in the exaction of mortuary dues (pp. 134-6, ll. 62ff.) and in the observance of the vow of chastity is explicitly detailed by the Peurman. It is also implicit in the ease with which the Pardonar gulls the Peurman and the Sowttar and his Wyfe who are obviously lamentably lacking instruction in the doctrines of the Church. Like its predecessors this interlude does give some indications that disorder will not finally triumph. Downtrodden as he is, the Peurman has a vigour similar to that which characterises Bessy in the Proclamatioun. Diligence is not able to prevent him from sitting upon the king's throne and he does in the end avenge himself upon the Pardonar. He is able to cope with the ludicrously chaotic world in which he lives. There is also a hint that a remedy of the sort proposed in Gude Counsale's opening speech, rather than merely a palliative, for the

chaos may be at hand, for Wilkin warns the Pardonar '...keip 3ow fra subiectioun/Of that curst king correctioun' (p. 143, ll. 272-3).

The Folly interlude makes explicit what has hitherto been implicit, namely that disorder is an essential and ineradicable element of human life: 'Stultorum numerus Infinitus' (p. 158, l. 200). That it is only human life which is so afflicted is stressed. Folly declares: 'I think no schame sa chryst me saive/To be ane fule amang the laive' (p. 158, l. 205). The interlude closes with Folly interceding on behalf of a court fool:

pray for the sawle of gud kae cappetie  
Quha laitly drownd him self in to lochlevin  
That his sweit sawle may be aboif in hevin.  
(P. 163, ll. 344-6)

It may be objected that the utterances of Folly cannot be regarded as having authority but the last quoted, at least, does seem to be an especial case. This is partly because the reference is to a real person<sup>48</sup> and partly because of the uncharacteristic restraint of the diction and charity of the content. In the immediate context of the play, help is certainly seen to be close at hand. Folly's question to Diligence is much more specific than was Wilkin's hint:

I heirsay thair is cum to the toun  
Ane king callit correctioun  
I pray 3ou tell me quhilk Is he (p. 151, ll. 57-9)

and its accuracy is immediately confirmed by Diligence's response:

'3one with the wingis ma thow not se' (p. 151, l. 60).

The fourth interlude introduces the Vices. They are impressive on two counts. First, because of their very clear perceptions of the tactics which must be pursued to achieve the conquest of the king. They do not actually send for the Teilgeour and the Sowttar but Flattry's 'We mon

---

<sup>48</sup>Hamer, Works, IV, p. 240.

turne our claithis and chainge our stylis' (p. 167, l. 94) is an acknowledgement of the superficiality of the courtly exterior. The second reason for the impression of strength which the Vices make is that they do not underrate their adversaries. In his first speech Dissait explains:

I met gud counsale be þe way  
 quha pot me in ane fellone fray  
 I gife him to þe divill (p. 166, ll. 60-2)

he later insists upon the necessity for haste upon the grounds that

ffra tyme the king begin to steir Him  
 gud counsale than I dreid cum neir Him  
 And be we knawin with correctioun  
 It will be our confusioun. (p. 167, ll. 87-90)

Falsatt, too, shares his anxiety: 'Bot with correctioun And we be kend/  
 I dreid we mak a schamefull End' (p. 170, ll. 147-8). The triple baptism continues the technique of presenting disorder as being essentially comic, but at the same time, because here the distortion of values involves blasphemy, highlights the underlying seriousness of this, the culminating example of chaos in the play. The comedy of the seduction of the king was seen to be slightly undercut by the circumstance that it followed hard upon his prayer. The parody of the sacrament by the Vices is a far grosser offence, because prayer is made the occasion of sin.

After the entrance of the king it quickly becomes apparent that the Vices will have little difficulty in achieving their object. That the world of the court has descended entirely into the world of the Proclamatioun is obvious from Denger's rebuke of the gross obscenity of Sollace:

Now fowll fall 3ow it is na bourdis  
 befoir ane king to speik fowll wowrdis  
 Or evir 3e cum that gait agane  
 To kiss my cloff 3e salbe fane. (p. 174, ll. 211-4)



Appropriately, the first note of courtliness is introduced by the disguised Vices: 'Lawd Honor gloir Trivmphand victorie/Be to your moist excellent maiestie' (p. 175, ll. 223-4), which of course is the culmination of the process, which began with juxtaposition of the courtly and the colloquial, by which the credibility of the sort of order represented by courtliness is destroyed. Although it is heavily overshadowed by the serious implications noted in connection with the parodic baptism, the reception of the Vices by the king is the last broadly comic presentation of disorder in the play. The fifth interlude is uniformly grim.

It begins with the approach of Gude Counsale, but he is rapidly 'bostit away' (p. 180) and Chestetie and Veretie are confined to the stocks. Thralldom to the Vices leads, not merely to rejection of the Virtues, but to their complete oppression. There are however some optimistic signs. Despite their apparently complete dominance the Vices recognise the absolute necessity of preventing Gude Counsale from approaching the king: 'get he Anis to be kingis presence/We thre will get na audience' (p. 180, ll. 9-10). And Gude Counsale remains free. Most promising is the final speech of the interlude in which Veretie prophesies the advent of Correctioun.

Implicit in the term interlude is the notion of self-containedness, and it is true that each of the interludes in the play, with the exception of the fifth, which is a special case and is discussed below, could be acted independently of the others. But, as has been shown, there are strong thematic connections between the interludes and they do present a progressive slide into evil. The division into interludes reflects the apparently quite clear separation of relatively unimportant indulgence in sins of the flesh,

from utter foolishness, and of folly from the pursuit of an entirely vicious life. The interrelatedness of the interludes demonstrates that the first lapse inevitably leads to the next and more serious transgression. It would not be possible to achieve these effects if the order of the interludes was rearranged.

Diligence's assertion that his proclamation of the assembly of parliament is issued 'At the command of king humanitie' (p. 190, l.1) is unsupported and seems dubious. The last utterance of the king was an abdication of authority in favour of Sensualitie:

As evir 3e pleiss sweit hairt so sall it be  
 Dispone hir as 3e think expedient  
 Evin as 3e list To latt hir leif Or de  
 I will refer to 3ow þat Iugement. (p. 189, ll. 162-5)

The announcement of Correctioun's arrival, with which part two begins, on the other hand carries immediate conviction. His credentials are of the highest:

God furth of hevin he hes him send  
 To puneiss all þat dois offend  
 Vnto his maiestie (p. 192, ll. 45-7)

and are supported by the previous expressions of confidence by Gude Counsale, and, more immediately, Veretie, and of trepidation by Wilkin and the Vices. The effect of the announcement is instantaneous. The Vices depart in disarray. Once Correctioun actually appears, the restoration of order proceeds apace. The Virtues are released and proceed to Rex Humanitas with Correctioun. One feeble protest is voiced:

Be quhome haif 3e so grit awtoritie  
 Quhilk dois presome for till correct a king  
 Knaw 3e nocht me the king humanitie  
 That in My regioun royally did ring. (p. 199, ll. 197-200)

Correctioun enlightens him and gives a practical demonstration of his power in the succinct command to Sensualitie: 'Swyth harlot henss the withowt dillatioun' (p. 199, l. 208). The Virtues are received by the king. Correctioun orders him to proclaim a parliament and pardons Wantones, Sollace

and Placebo upon their promise of good behaviour. The entrance of the three estates is quite overshadowed by the entrance of Iohine the Commoun weill whose vigour is reminiscent of Peurman's. The trite response of the king to Iohine the Commoun weill's revelation of his identity - 'The commoun weill hes bene amang his fais' (p. 206, l. 344) - is his final utterance and his presence is never again acknowledged. Correctioun authoritatively intervenes: 'Iohine quhome vpoun complene 3e or quho makis 3ow debaitis' (p. 206, l. 346) and having heard the complaint, orders that the Vices be imprisoned. The lay estates quickly acknowledge their errors, are pardoned by Correctioun and embrace Iohine the Commoun weill. Correctioun completely ignores the discontented whinings of Spiritualitie and proceeds to the hanging of the Vices. This accomplished, he rehabilitates Iohine the Commoun weill, who celebrates the restitution of order. Gude Counsale's initial assertion (p. 124, l. 592), that only God's grace can save fallen man from being completely overwhelmed by the disorder which constantly menaces him, which is confirmed by the absolute sureness with which Correctioun speedily eradicates the Vices, the causes of that disorder, is given a final acknowledgement in Diligence's prologue with the references to 'Iesu chryst our saluour' (p. 237, l.10).

Presuming for the moment that the source of B was a text substantially similar to C it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bannatyne's version constitutes a radical criticism of Lindsay's play. For Bannatyne's contemporaries, when Reformation controversies were topical, the sense of his edition of the play offering a corrective to Lindsay's must have been particularly acute. In C the absolute necessity for reform of the state and, more particularly, of the church is insisted upon; once this is achieved evil will disappear from the world. What are presented as



serious abuses in C become in B merely the comic posturing and attitudinising which is the invariable accompaniment of man's attempt to impose his order upon this transitory world. Institutions such as the estates are not intrinsically evil; merely comically ineffectual. Their abolition is never suggested in B; it would after all be quite pointless to expend energy on the creation of another, equally flawed, system, especially when those energies ought properly to be directed towards eternal salvation, which of course involves reliance upon the mercy of 'Iesu chryst our saluour' (p. 237, l.10). Meanwhile

ffor 3our plesour we sall devyse ane sport  
 plesand till every gentill creatour  
 To raiss 3our spreitis to plesour and confort  
 (pp. 237-8, ll. 15-17)

### Conclusion

The terms 'addition', 'omission' and 'rearrangement' have so far been used to describe these three categories of differences between the two texts with only occasional recourse to the qualification 'in B as compared with C' as protection against the charge that their use implies that Bannatyne's source was identical with that of the 1602 text of the play. This is a question which it is beyond the scope of this thesis fully to explore. It is however proposed to examine Bannatyne's statements about his editorial practice in order to establish whether his explanations provide any clues as to the sort of play he shaped, or thought he was shaping, from his source. An incidental result of this will be to show that, although not every 'omission' and 'rearrangement' can certainly be attributed to Bannatyne, enough of them can be to justify the use of these terms and to establish that his source had a good deal in common with that of the 1602 text. Additions are a special case. Of the two most important, the inclusion of the Proclamatioun was certainly the result of a decision made by Bannatyne, whereas the middle stanza of Diligence's prologue is much more likely to be an omission from the 1602 text.

Bannatyne's first statement about his editorial practice prefaces the play:

Heir begynnys ser dauid lyndsay play maid  
In the grenesyde besyd Edinburgh quhilk  
I writtin bot schortly be Interludis levand  
the grave mater pairof becaus the samyne  
abvse Is weill reformit in scotland praysit  
be god quhairthrow I omittit that principall  
Mater and writtin only Sertane mirry  
Interludis pairof verry plesand  
beginning at the first part of the play. (p. 101)

At first reading this impresses as a straightforward account of Bannatyne's treatment of his source and the reason why he proceeded as he did.

Perhaps 'praysit be god' has a slightly unctuous quality but otherwise the statement appears unexceptionable. The difficulty is that it is incompatible with what follows. First of all, the reason given for the omission of 'the grave mater' conflicts with the explanations provided immediately before the two most substantial series of omissions:

Correctioun enteris I tak heir bot  
certane schort pairtis owt of the speichis  
becauss of lang proces of the Play (p. 196)

and

Heir I omit the actis maid at this parliament with  
with [sic] the reformation of the sprituall estait becauss  
the same is prolixit and sa passis to the conclusion.  
(p. 237)

Secondly, the text of the play itself is not consistent with the opening description, 'the grave mater' is not omitted; abuses that were at least theoretically 'weill reformit' by 1568, or even by 1565, survive in Bannatyne's text. As was observed in the discussions of both the omissions and rearrangements, the corruption of the spiritual estate, the 'abvse' to which Bannatyne clearly refers in his opening statement is preserved in B. The corruption is not presented in anything like the detail that it is in C, but Spiritualitie in B is unchaste (pp. 124; 187), ruthless in its exaction of mortuary dues (pp. 213-15, ll. 52-47) and tithes (p. 214, ll. 548-53), and neglectful of preaching (p. 214, ll. 550-2). Ecclesiastical courts are venal (pp. 215-16, ll. 574-89) and Spiritualitie is implacably opposed to reform (p. 215, ll. 560-1; p. 216, ll. 600-3). Patently the 'lang proces of the Play' and prolixity more accurately account for the omissions than does the explanation given in the opening statement.



There is a further discrepancy between the actual text of the play and its description in the opening statement: Bannatyne claims to be including 'only Sertane mirry Interludis.' The first part of the play is divided into five interludes, but the second part is not divided at all and is not itself entitled an interlude by Bannatyne, as is his invariable practice throughout part one. The adjective 'mirry', too, invites comment, although the need for extreme caution in the interpretation of this word is recognised; Dunbar's Lament for the Makaris is included by Bannatyne amongst 'balletis mirry'.<sup>49</sup> 'Mirry' is rather insisted upon by Bannatyne in connection with the play; the adjective occurs again before the second interlude:

Heir followis certane mirry and sportsum  
Interludis contenit in the play maid be ser  
dauid lindsay of the month knyght in the  
playfeild of Edinburcht to the mocking of abusionis  
vsit in the cuntre be diuerss sortis of Estait, (p. 130)

A modern reader has no difficulty in accepting 'mirry' as an appropriate description of the first four interludes; when applied to the fifth interlude it does present problems. With the exception of the fifth, Bannatyne's division of the first part of the play into interludes can be explained as admissions of the rearrangement of episodes. The Peurman and the Pardonar and the Folly interludes are, for example, separated by 'Heir endis this Interlud and followis ane vpir Interlud of the samyne play' (p. 149), which does seem to suggest that in the source the two episodes did not follow each other. But the line order of B at the end of the fourth interlude and at the beginning of the fifth corresponds exactly to that of C. Furthermore, Bannatyne's intervention is deliberately lengthened by the addition of a synopsis of forthcoming events:

ffinis of this Interlude and pairt of Play  
Heireftir sall gud counsale appeir and  
salbe bostit away and lady chestetie and  
verretie sall be put in stokis And Sensualitie  
Sall gyd the zung king for a tyme. (p. 180)

<sup>49</sup>II, pp. 287-91.

This interrupts Rex Humanitas in mid-speech. The hiatus created occurs between the complete acceptance of the disguised Vices, '3e ar all wylcum be the rude/3e seme to be thre men of gude' (p. 180, ll. 311-2), and his sighting of Gude Counsall, indeed just at the point where the 'mirry' gulling of Rex Humanitas by the Vices is succeeded by the sombre events which emphasise the point, already made by the presentation of Sensualitie and Chestetie, namely, that the acceptance of evil involves the active rejection of good. The only possible justification for the description of the fifth interlude as 'mirry' is that it ends optimistically with Veretie's prophecy of Correctioun's arrival. Although, as has been noticed, all the broadly comic stage business of C (the estates going backwards, Spiritualitie's reception of Sensualitie and its display of rage and the deprivation of the Priores) is omitted from B, part two is fundamentally 'mirry', for evil is exterminated and order restored. Certainly the sort of merriment which distinguishes the first four interludes is very different from that of the fifth interlude and of part two. The use of 'mirry' as a blanket adjective to describe the whole play is not therefore very satisfactory. It is in fact used only of the first part for on both occasions it qualifies 'interludis' and, as has been noticed, part two is not an interlude. The second time 'mirry' occurs it is coupled with 'sportsum', an obsolete Scots word meaning 'amusing, diverting, sportive'.<sup>50</sup> It is suggested that Bannatyne intended 'mirry' to be read as synonymous with 'sportsum'. The inappropriateness of this sense to the fifth interlude was evidently outweighed by Bannatyne's desire to stress the purely amusing nature of his version of Lindsay's play. The interesting question is why he should want to do so.

---

<sup>50</sup>O.E.D. 'Sportsome'; only two citations are recorded, both from Bellenden's Livy (1533).

Any attempt to answer the question must of course be speculative but it seems at least possible that Bannatyne's insistence that his version of the play is merely light entertainment was prompted by the realisation that not all his readers could be relied upon to view his editorial activities sympathetically.

Bannatyne's failure to tamper with his texts in the interests of conformity with Protestant doctrine has already been remarked. Lindsay's play is however a special case. At least eight years before the Reformation Parliament of August 1560 it presented the extreme urgency of the need for reformation. In Bannatyne's version of the play *Spiritualitie's* corruption is presented as being of only peripheral importance, the possibility of its deprivation and replacement by committed clerics is never even raised as a solution to the disorders of society. There is a very profound sense in which Bannatyne's version of Lindsay's play is anti-Reformation and whilst a Protestant censor might just conceivably be imagined as tolerating the expression of Catholic dogma in a pre-Reformation poem like, for example, The Houlate (ll. 735-45) he could hardly be expected to exhibit the same tolerance towards what would, from his perspective, appear to be a deliberate perversion of his ideals. It is suggested, therefore, that Bannatyne intended such a reader to interpret 'mirry' in its most trivial sense and to take the opening declaration of intent as meaning 'since the Reformation all is well in Scotland and there is therefore no point in rehearsing past evils; I shall consequently merely divert you with the funny parts of Lindsay's play.' Having made which disclaimer he was free to go ahead and bend the text to his will.

This is not of course to claim that Bannatyne's source was the same as that of the 1602 version of the play. Many very significant omissions



are not specifically acknowledged by Bannatyne, including, for example, the dialogue which accompanies the rejections of Chastitie by the Priores, Spiritualitie and Temporalitie in C (ll. 1208-79) and the opening sermon of Veritie (ll. 1026-1068). 'I writtin bot schortly' in the opening statement may be read as a general admission which absolves the editor from itemising every comparatively short admission, specific acknowledgements being reserved only for those which are of considerable length. It could however equally well be argued that because upon two occasions Bannatyne announces his intention of omitting material immediately before the omissions occur, those which are not specifically acknowledged are material which was not in his source. A similar problem is presented by rearrangements. Although it seems very probable that the statement which separates the Peurman and the Pardonar episode from the Folly episode is tantamount to an admission of reordering, this is not indisputable. The phrase at the end of the opening statement, too, 'begynning at the first part of the play,' seems rather superfluous except as an indication that the original order will not invariably be followed, but again it does not amount to an unequivocal admission of rearrangement of material. Only once is such a statement made: 'Heir I omit the nixt mater following: because it is writtin heirefter In the leif quhair flattry Enteris' (p. 124). This does signal a rather different kind of reordering from the rearrangement of complete episodes because it refers to the excision of the second part of Chestetie's rejection from, what is in B, the fifth interlude and its incorporation in the first interlude. The acceptance of this argument, however, leaves unaccounted for the very important transference of the rehabilitation of Iohine the Commoun weill to the end of the play in B. It is not an

interlude, either, and Bannatyne makes no acknowledgement of rearrangement.

All that can certainly be claimed about the relationship between B and C, then, is that Bannatyne makes sufficient specific acknowledgements of editorial interference to indicate that if the two texts do not proceed from a common source, their sources were remarkably similar in many important respects. In either case Bannatyne emerges as a quite remarkably skilful editor. If only the acknowledged variations are Bannatyne's own, then the expertise demanded to make these consistent with what he found in his source is no less than that required to modify the source of C to produce B.

It is odd that Wittig should dismiss B as extracts<sup>51</sup> for the text of Lindsay's play which is preserved in the Ballat Buke, due to a considerable, if not precisely determinable, extent to the editorial activities of George Bannatyne does imply the sort of criticism of C which is made by the twentieth century scholar:

Lyndsay shows considerable dramatic talent - more certainly, than his English contemporaries. Though it could stand thorough pruning, the Thrie Estaitis has, despite its length, a remarkable unity.<sup>52</sup>

The criticism which Speirs, who does not mention the Bannatyne version, makes of C is also implicitly supported by B:

It is simply a by no means promising modification, in some respects dissipation, of the Morality tradition.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Kurt Wittig, The Scottish Tradition in Literature, Edinburgh and London, 1958, p. 96.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 100.

<sup>53</sup>John Speirs, The Scots Literary Tradition, (2nd edition), London, 1962, p. 81.

But of course the criticism offered by Bannatyne to his readers is a good deal more constructive than that offered by Lindsay's twentieth century critics. It is overstating the case to claim that Bannatyne transformed a piece of Scottish Reformation propaganda into a play having universal significance. It is perfectly just to claim that in his version of the play the limitations implicit in MacQueen's description of C as '... an Aristophanic comedy, which freely satirizes the social, political and ecclesiastical situation of the day',<sup>54</sup> are removed.

---

<sup>54</sup>MacQueen, 'Ane Satyre', p. 142.



# Bibliography

- Anderson, W. I., 'Rome and Scotland, 1513-1625', Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.
- Arnot, Hugo, History of Edinburgh (2nd ed.) London, 1779.
- Bannatyne, George, The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) J. B. Murdoch, 4 vols., Hunterian Club, 1896.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Bannatyne Manuscript, (ed.) W. Tod Ritchie, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1928-34.
- Chambers, E. K., The Mediaeval Stage, 2 vols., London, 1903.
- Donaldson, Gordon, The Scottish Reformation, Cambridge, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Scotland: James V - James VII, Edinburgh, 1971.
- Durkan, John, 'The Cultural Background in Sixteenth Century Scotland', Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.
- Graf, Claude, 'Theatre and Politics: Lindsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Bards and Makars, (ed.) A. J. Aitken et al, Glasgow, 1977.
- Hamer, Douglas, 'The Bibliography of Sir David Lindsay (1490-1555)', The Library, Fourth Series, Vol. X, (June 1929), pp. 1-42.
- Harwood, Vernon, 'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis Again', Studies in Scottish Literature, Vol. 6, (1969-70), pp. 139-46.
- Henderson, T. F., Scottish Vernacular Literature, Edinburgh, 1910.
- Houk, R. A., 'Versions of Lindsay's Satire of the Three Estates', PMLA, Vol. 55, (1940), pp. 396-405.
- Hughes, Joan and Ramson, W.S., Poetry of the Stewart Court, Canberra, (forthcoming)
- Kantrowitz, J. S., Dramatic Allegory: Lindsay's Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, University of Nebraska, 1975.

- Kenneth, Brotter, 'The Popular Literature of the Scottish Reformation',  
Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts,  
 Glasgow, 1962.
- Knox, John, History of the Reformation in Scotland, (ed.)  
 W. Croft Dickinson, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1949.
- Lindsay, David, Lyndsay's Poetical Works, (ed.) George Chalmers, London,  
 1806.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, 1490-1555,  
 (ed.) Douglas Hamer, 4 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1931-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, (ed.) James Kinsley,  
 London, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Poetical Works of Sir David Lyndsay, (ed.) David  
 Laing, Edinburgh, 1871.
- Lyall, R. J., 'The Linlithgow Interlude', paper given at the Second  
 International Conference on Scottish Language and  
 Literature, Medieval and Renaissance, Strasbourg, July  
 1978.
- MacQueen, John, 'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Studies in Scottish  
 Literature, Vol. 3, (1965-6), pp. 129-43.
- Mahoney, Matthew, 'The Scottish Hierarchy', Essays on the Scottish  
 Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.
- Mayer, C. A., '"Satyre" as a Dramatic Genre', Bibliothèque  
 d'Humanisme et Renaissance, Vol. 13, (1951), pp. 327-33.
- Mill, A. J., Mediaeval Plays in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1927
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Influence of the Continental Drama on Lyndsay's  
Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Modern Language Review, Vol. 25  
 (1930), pp. 425-42.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Representations of Lyndsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', PMLA, Vol. 47, (1932), pp. 636-49. Corrigenda in PMLA Vol. 48, (1933) pp. 315-6.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Original Version of Lindsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', Studies in Scottish Literature, Vol. 6, (1968-9), pp. 67-75.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Records of Scots Medieval Plays: Interpretations and Misinterpretations', Bards and Makars, (ed.) A. J. Aitken et al., Glasgow, 1977.
- Miller, E. S., 'The Christening in The Three Estates', Modern Language Notes, Vol. 60, (1945), pp. 42-4.
- Mohl, Ruth, The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature, New York, 1933.
- Pinkerton, John, Scotish Poems reprinted from Scarce Editions, 3 vols., London, 1792.
- Pitscottie, Robert Lindesay of, The Historie and Cronicles of Scotland (ed.) A.J.G. MacKay, 2 vols., Scottish Text Society, 1899.
- Ramson, William, 'On Bannatyne's Editing', Bards and Makars, (ed.) A. J. Aitken et al., Glasgow, 1977.
- Ross, Anthony, 'Some Notes on the Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation Scotland', Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.
- 
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Reformation and Repression', Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.) David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.
- Sibbald, James, (ed.) Chronicle of Scottish Poetry, 4 vols., London, 1802.
- Speirs, John, The Scots Literary Tradition, (2nd ed.), London, 1962.
- Taylor, Maurice, 'The Conflicting Doctrines of the Scottish Reformation' Essays on the Scottish Reformation, (ed.), David McRoberts, Glasgow, 1962.



Wittig, Kurt, The Scottish Tradition in Literature, London, 1958.

Wyclif, John, The English Works of Wyclif, (ed.), F. D. Matthew,  
Early English Text Society, (revised ed.), 1902.